arXiv:1611.04497v1 [math.PR] 14 Nov 2016

Favorite sites of randomly biased walks on a supercritical Galton–Watson tree

by

Dayue Chen, Loïc de Raphélis, and Yueyun Hu

Peking University, ENS de Lyon, and Université Paris XIII

November 14, 2016

Summary. Erdős and Révész [15] initiated the study of favorite sites by considering the one-dimensional simple random walk. We investigate in this paper the same problem for a class of null-recurrent randomly biased walks on a supercritical Gaton-Watson tree. We prove that there is some parameter $\kappa \in (1, \infty]$ such that the set of the favorite sites of the biased walk is almost surely bounded in the case $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$, tight in the case $\kappa = 2$, and oscillates between a neighborhood of the root and the boundary of the range in the case $\kappa \in (1, 2)$. Moreover, our results yield a complete answer to the cardinality of the set of favorite sites in the case $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$. The proof relies on the exploration of the Markov property of the local times process with respect to the space variable and on a precise tail estimate on the maximum of local times, using a change of measure for multi-type Galton-Watson trees.

Keywords. Biased random walk on the Galton–Watson tree, local times, favorite sites, multitype Galton-Watson tree.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60J80, 60G50, 60K37.

Cooperation between D.C. and Y.H. was supported by NSFC 11528101.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University Beijing 100871 China, dayue@math.pku.edu.cn

UMPA, ENS de Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France, loic.de-raphelis@ens-lyon.fr

LAGA, Université Paris XIII, 99 avenue J-B Clément, F-93430 Villetaneuse, France, yueyun@math.univ-paris13.fr

1 Introduction

The study of favorite sites goes back to Erdős and Révész [15] where they considered the simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$, and conjectured that

(a) the set of favorite sites is tight;

(b) the cardinality of the set of favorite sites is eventually bounded by 2.

We refer to Révész ([35], Chapter 13) for a list of ten open problems on the favorite sites.

Conjecture (b) still remains open and the best result so far was obtained by Tóth [39]. Conjecture (a) was disproved by Bass and Griffin [7] who showed the almost sure transience of the favorite sites for the simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$ as well as for the one-dimensional Brownian motion. We note in passing that the exact rate of escape of the favorite sites is still an open problem. Later, the transience of the favorite sites was established by Bass, Eisenbaum and Shi [6], Marcus [31], Eisenbaum and Khoshnevisan [14] for Lévy processes and even for fairly general Markov processes, and by Hu and Shi [21] for Sinai's one-dimensional random walk in random environment. One may wonder whether the favorite sites are always transient for general "non-trivial" null-recurrent Markov processes. This was however disproved by Hu and Shi [23]: the set of the favorite sites is tight for a class of randomly biased walks on trees in the slow-movement regime. The present paper is to address the same question in the sub-diffusive regime. The answer is more complicated and is depending on some parameter $\kappa \in (1, \infty]$. For a class of biased walk on tree, conditioned upon the set of non-extinction of the tree, the set of favorite sites will be almost surely bounded if $\kappa > 2$, tight if $\kappa = 2$, and may move to infinity almost surely if $1 < \kappa < 2$. As a consequence of our results, we can give a complete answer to the cardinality of the set of favorite sites when $\kappa > 2$.

Let us define now the model of the randomly biased walk on trees, a model introduced by Lyons and Pemantle [30]. Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a supercritical Galton–Watson tree, rooted at $\varnothing$. For any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, let $\overleftarrow{x}$ be its parent. Let $\omega := (\omega(x, \cdot),\, x \in \mathbb{T})$ be a sequence of vectors such that for each vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $\omega(x,\, y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\sum_{y\in\mathbb{T}} \omega(x,\, y) = 1$. We assume that $\omega(x,\, y) > 0$ if and only if either $\overleftarrow{x} = y$ or $\overleftarrow{y} = x$. Denote by $|x|$ the generation of the vertex x in $\mathbb{T}$. We shall also use the partial order on the tree: for any $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$, we write $y < x$ if and only if y is an ancestor of x (and $y \leq x$ iff $y < x$ or $y = x$).

For the sake of presentation, we add a specific vertex $\overleftarrow{\varnothing}$, considered as the parent of $\varnothing$. We stress that $\overleftarrow{\varnothing}$ is not a vertex of $\mathbb{T}$, for instance, $\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}} f(x)$ does not contain the term $f(\overleftarrow{\varnothing})$. We define $\omega(\overleftarrow{\varnothing}, \varnothing) := 1$ and modify the vector $\omega(\varnothing, \cdot)$ such that $\omega(\varnothing, \overleftarrow{\varnothing}) > 0$

and $\omega(\varnothing, \overleftarrow{\varnothing}) + \sum_{x:\overleftarrow{x}=\varnothing} \omega(\varnothing, x) = 1$.

For given ω, the randomly biased walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a Markov chain on $\mathbb{T} \cup \{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}\}$ with transition probabilities ω, starting from $\varnothing$; i.e. $X_0 = \varnothing$ and

$$P_\omega\big(X_{n+1} = y \,|\, X_n = x\big) = \omega(x,\, y).$$

For any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$, let $(x^{(1)}, \cdots, x^{(\nu_x)})$ be its children, where $\nu_x \geq 0$ is the number of children of x. Define $\mathbf{A}(x) := (A(x^{(i)}),\, 1 \leq i \leq \nu_x)$ by

$$A(x^{(i)}) := \frac{\omega(x,\, x^{(i)})}{\omega(x,\, \overleftarrow{x})}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq \nu_x\,.$$

We denote the vector $\mathbf{A}(\varnothing)$ by $(A_1, ..., A_\nu)$. As such, $\nu \equiv \nu_\varnothing$ is the number of children of $\varnothing$. When ν is an integer (i.e. $\mathbb{T}$ is a regular tree), we suppose that $(\mathbf{A}(x))_{x\in\mathbb{T}}$ are i.i.d. In general, when ν is also random, we may construct a marked tree as in Neveu [33] such that for any $k \geq 0$, conditionally on $\{\mathbf{A}(x), |x| \leq k\}$, the random variables $(\mathbf{A}(y))_{|y|=k+1}$ are i.i.d. and distributed as $\mathbf{A}(\varnothing)$. There is an obvious bijection between $(\mathbf{A}(x))_{x\in\mathbb{T}}$ and $(\mathbb{T}, \omega)$ and we shall both notation interchangeably.

Denote by $\mathbf{P}$ the law of $(\mathbb{T}, \omega)$ and define $\mathbb{P}(\cdot) := \int P_\omega(\cdot)\mathbf{P}(d\omega)$. In the language of random walk in random environment, P_ω is referred to the quenched probability whereas $\mathbb{P}$ is the annealed probability.

Assume that $\mathbf{P}(\nu = \infty) = 0$, $\mathbf{E}(\nu) \in (1, \infty]$, $\mathbf{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i |\log A_i|\big) < \infty$ and

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i\Big) = 1, \qquad \mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i \log A_i\Big) < 0. \tag{1.1}$$

We suppose that

$$\begin{cases} \text{either there exists a } \kappa \in (1,\infty) \text{ such that } \mathbf{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^\kappa\big) = 1; \\ \text{or } \mathbf{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^t\big) < 1 \text{ for any } t > 1, \text{ and define } \kappa := \infty \text{ in this case.} \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

For the sake of presentation, we suppose that

$$\text{the support of } \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \delta_{\{\log A_i\}} \text{ is non-lattice when } 1 < \kappa \leq 2. \tag{1.3}$$

We furthermore assume an integrability condition which is slightly stronger than the usual $X^\kappa \log X$-type condition as in Liu [28]: when $1 < \kappa < \infty$, there exists some $\alpha > \kappa$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i\big)^\alpha < \infty, \tag{1.4}$$

and when $\kappa = \infty$, we assume that (1.4) holds for some $\alpha > 2$.

It is known from Lyons and Pemantle ([30]), Menshikov and Petritis [32] and Faraud [16] that under (1.1), $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is null-recurrent. When (1.1) and (1.2) are fulfilled, $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ may be diffusive or subdiffusive. For instance, we have proved in [22] that if furthermore ν equals some integer, then almost surely,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log n} \log \max_{0\leq i\leq n} |X_i| = 1 - \max(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\kappa}). \tag{1.5}$$

When κ is sufficiently large (say $\kappa \in (5, \infty]$), Faraud [16] proved an invariance principle for $(|X_n|)_{n\geq 0}$, in line of Peres and Zeitouni [34]. Recently, Aïdékon and de Raphélis [1] proved that for any $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$, the tree visited by the walk, after renormalization, converges to the Brownian forest. When $1 < \kappa \leq 2$, a similar convergence also holds, but towards the stable forest, and the height function of the walk also satisfies a central limit theorem, see [13]. We refer to Andreoletti and Debs [4, 5], Andreoletti and Chen [3] for the recent studies of the spread and local times of the biased walk in both subdiffusive and slow-movement regimes. For further detailed references and open problems, see the survey paper by Ben Arous and Fribergh [8].

In this paper, we are interested in the favorite sites of the walk. Let

$$L_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{\{X_i = x\}}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{T},\ n \geq 1,$$

be the local times process of $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$. The set of the favorite sites is defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{F}(n) := \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{T} : L_n(x) = \max_{y\in\mathbb{T}} L_n(y) \Big\}.$$

Denote by $\mathbf{P}^*$ the probability $\mathbf{P}$ conditioned on the non-extinction of the Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$:

$$\mathbf{P}^*(\bullet) := \mathbf{P}\Big(\bullet \mid \mathbb{T} \text{ is infinite} \Big),$$

and denote by $\mathbb{P}^*$ the (annealed) probability conditioned on the set of non-extinction of $\mathbb{T}$: $\mathbb{P}^*(\cdot) := \int P_\omega(\cdot)\mathbf{P}^*(d\omega)$.

The main result of this paper is the following description of the favorite sites in the (sub)diffusive regime.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) *and* (1.4).

(i) If $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$, then $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely,

$$\mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}, \qquad \textit{for all large } n, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\mathscr{M}$ defined in (2.2)*, is almost surely finite.*

(ii) If $\kappa = 2$, then $(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)} |x|)_{n\geq 1}$ is tight; more precisely,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}\Big) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{1.7}$$

(iii) If $1 < \kappa < 2$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}+\varepsilon} \inf_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)} |x| = \infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-}a.s., \tag{1.8}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)} |x| < \infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-}a.s. \tag{1.9}$$

Remark 1.2 *The assumption* (1.3) *is used in the papers [2, 13], see the proof of Lemma 4.1 and Fact 4.7. Should there be a lattice version of their estimates, then* (1.3) *could be removed.*

As mentioned before, in the slow-movement regime (which corresponds informally to $\kappa = 1$), we have proved in [23] that the set of favorite sites is tight.

In the case $1 < \kappa < 2$, $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s., $\max_{0\leq i\leq n} |X_i| = n^{\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}+o(1)}$ (see (1.5)), so (1.8) says that up to $n^{o(1)}$, the favorite sites could reach as far as the upper limits of the walk itself.

It is worthy noticing the phase transition at $\kappa = 2$. The almost sure oscillation in the case $1 < \kappa < 2$ seems rather surprising, because a priori, we cannot expect a localization of a null-recurrent walk on the tree, in contrast with the one-dimensional random walk in random environment on $\mathbb{Z}$.

Let us present now two consequences of Theorem 1.1 on the structure of the set of favorite sites. The first one deals with the cardinality of the set of favorite sites: we show that when $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$, it is eventually bounded by 3 and this bound is optimal.

Corollary 1.3 *If $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$, then $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely,*

$$\#\mathbb{F}(n) \leq 3 \text{ for all } n \text{ large enough.} \tag{1.10}$$

Moreover, almost surely there will be infinitely many n such that $\#\mathbb{F}(n) = \min(3, \#\mathscr{M})$.

The second corollary studies the vertices which are favorite sites infinitely many times. We show that for any $\kappa \in (1, \infty]$, such vertices do exist and must be in $\mathscr{M}$. Moreover, if $\kappa \in [2, \infty]$, then all vertices in $\mathscr{M}$ will be favorite sites infinitely many times.

Corollary 1.4 *If $\kappa \in (1,\infty]$, then $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}.$$

Moreover,

- *If $\kappa \in (1,2)$, then a.s. there exists $x \in \mathscr{M}$ such that $x \in \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n)$.*
- *If $\kappa \in [2,\infty]$, then $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n) = \mathscr{M}$ a.s.*

Let us now describe the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The main step will be the exploration of the Markov property on the space variable x of the local times process. It will be more convenient to consider the edge local times $(\overline{L}_n(x))_{n\geq 1, x\in\mathbb{T}}$ defined as follows:

$$\overline{L}_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{\{X_{i-1}=\overleftarrow{x}, X_i = x\}}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{T},\, n \geq 1. \tag{1.11}$$

We define a sequence of stopping times $(\overline{T}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ by induction: for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\overline{T}_n := \inf\{k > \overline{T}_{n-1} : X_{k-1} = \overleftarrow{\varnothing},\, X_k = \varnothing\}, \tag{1.12}$$

with $\overline{T}_0 := 0$. By definition, $\overline{T}_n - 1$ is exactly the n^{th} return time to $\overleftarrow{\varnothing}$ of the walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$.

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (cases $1 < \kappa \leq 2$) is the tail distribution of the maximum of (edge) local times considered at $\overline{T}_1$.

Denote by $f(x) \sim g(x)$ as $x \to x_0$ when $\lim_{x\to x_0} f(x)/g(x) = 1$ and $f(x) \asymp g(x)$ if $0 < \liminf_{x\to x_0} f(x)/g(x) \leq \limsup_{x\to x_0} f(x)/g(x) < \infty$.

Theorem 1.5 *Let $\kappa \in (1,\infty)$. Assume (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4). As $r \to \infty$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r\Big) \asymp \begin{cases} r^{-1}, & \text{if } 1 < \kappa < 2, \\ r^{-1}(\log r)^{-1/2}, & \text{if } \kappa = 2, \\ r^{-\kappa/2}, & \text{if } 2 < \kappa < \infty. \end{cases}$$

The same results hold when we replace $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ by $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$.

Remark 1.6 *We mention that in the case $1 < \kappa < 2$, $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ has a Cauchy-type tail (independent of the value of κ), such phenomenon is in the same flavor as in Bertoin [9], Corollary 1.*

To see how the asymptotic behaviors of the favorite sites ensue from Theorem 1.5, we introduce a set $\mathscr{Z}_k$ of vertices in $\mathbb{T}$:

$$\mathscr{Z}_k := \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{T} : \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x) = 1, \min_{\varnothing < y < x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y) \geq 2 \Big\}, \qquad k \geq 1, \tag{1.13}$$

which is the set of the vertices being the first of their ancestry line to be of edge local time 1. This set is represented on Figure 1. For any fixed $k \geq 1$, by the strong Markov property, we get the following identity in law under the annealed probability measure $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x) \overset{(\text{law})}{=} \max \Big(\max_{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_k} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), \max_{1 \leq i \leq \# \mathscr{Z}_k} \overline{L}^{*,i} \Big), \tag{1.14}$$

where $x \leq \mathscr{Z}_k$ means that either $x \in \mathscr{Z}_k$ or for any $\varnothing < y \leq x, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y) \geq 2$, and $(\overline{L}^{*,i})_{i \geq 1}$ are i.i.d. copies of $\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$, independent of $(\max_{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_k} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), \# \mathscr{Z}_k)$. A similar identity in law holds for the site local times $L_{\overline{T}_k}(x)$ instead of the edge local time $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)$.

Consider for instance the case $1 < \kappa < 2$. It is known (see the forthcoming Fact 4.7) that $\# \mathscr{Z}_k$ is of order k when $k \to \infty$, and it is not very hard to see that $\max_{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_k} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)$ is also of order k. By Theorem 1.5, $\overline{L}^{*,i}$ has the Cauchy-type tail, then an application of the extreme value theory based on (1.14) yields that along some subsequence $k \to \infty$, $\frac{1}{k} \max_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x) \to \infty$ (Propositon 5.1). This implies the almost sure unboundedness of the favorite sites. On the other hand, the favorite sites are either bounded or escape to infinity at a certain polynomial rate (see (3.3)). Combining the two facts we get the upper limits in (1.8). The lower limits in (1.9) can be obtained in a similar way.



Figure 1: The set $\mathscr{Z}_k$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2: we present the main technical tools, in particular the many-to-one formula for the branching random walk and a change of measure for the edge local times;
- Section 3: we give the proof of the part (1.6) in Theorem 1.1;
- Section 4: we prove Theorem 1.5 by establishing some results on an associated Markov chain which appears naturally in the change of measure for the edge local times;
- Section 5: we prove the remaining parts in Theorem 1.1, namely (1.7), (1.8) and (1.9) by using Theorem 1.5, and we give the proofs of Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4.

Throughout this paper, we denote by c, c', c'' (eventually with some subscripts) some positive constants whose values can change from one paragraph to another.

2 Preliminaries

This section is divided into three subsections: in the first subsection, we introduce the potential V of the biased walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$, and recall some known results on the potential V and on an associated one-dimensional random walk S; in the second subsection, we present a change of measure formula for the edge local times and some consequences; in the third (and last) subsection we collect some known facts on the random walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ which will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5.

2.1 The potential

Let us introduce $V = (V(x))_{x\in\mathbb{T}}$ the *random potential* of the biased random walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$, which will completely determine the behavior of (X_n). Define

$$V(\varnothing) := 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad V(x) := -\sum_{y\in\,]\!]\varnothing,\,x]\!]} \log\, A(y), \qquad \text{for } x\in\mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where $]\!]\varnothing,\, x]\!] := [\![\varnothing,\, x]\!]\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, with $[\![\varnothing,\, x]\!]$ denoting the set of vertices (including x and $\varnothing$) on the unique shortest path connecting $\varnothing$ to x. The process $(V(x), x\in\mathbb{T})$ is a branching random walk, in the usual sense of Biggins [10].

Let us define a symmetrized version of the potential which will naturally appear in the study of local times:

$$U(x) := V(x) - \log(\frac{1}{\omega(x,\,\overleftarrow{x})})\,, \qquad x\in\mathbb{T}\,.$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)} = \frac{1}{\omega(x,\overleftarrow{x})}\,\mathrm{e}^{-V(x)} = \mathrm{e}^{-V(x)} + \sum_{y\in\mathbb{T}:\,\overleftarrow{y}=x} \mathrm{e}^{-V(y)}, \qquad x\in\mathbb{T}\,.$$

Recall that $\mathbf{P}^*$ is the probability $\mathbf{P}$ conditioned on the non-extinction of the Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$. The Biggins-Hammersley-Kingman ([18, 26, 11]) law of the large numbers implies that under the assumptions (1.1) and (1.2), $\mathbf{P}^*$-almost surely, $\frac{1}{n}\min_{|x|=n} V(x)$ converges towards some positive constant. The following simple result deals with the symmetrized potential:

Lemma 2.1 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4). *As* $n\to\infty$,

$$\min_{|x|=n} U(x) \to \infty, \qquad \mathbf{P}^*\text{-}a.s.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. According to (1.2), we may choose some constant $t>1$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-tV(x)}\Big) < 1, \qquad \text{and} \qquad c := \mathbf{E}\big(1+\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-V(x)}\big)^t < \infty.$$

By the branching property, we have that for any $n\geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-tU(x)}\Big) &= \mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-tV(x)}\big(1+\sum_{y:\,\overleftarrow{y}=x} \mathrm{e}^{-(V(y)-V(x))}\big)^t\Big)\\
&= c\,\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-tV(x)}\Big)\\
&= c\,\Big(\mathbf{E}\big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\,|x|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-tV(x)}\big)\Big)^n,
\end{aligned}$$

whose sum on n converges. Therefore Borel-Cantelli's lemma yields that $\sum_{x:\,|x|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-tU(x)} \to 0$, $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., and Lemma 2.1 follows. □

Consequently, the set of minimums of U, defined as below, is finite almost surely:

$$\mathscr{M} := \Big\{x\in\mathbb{T} : U(x) = \min_{y\in\mathbb{T}} U(y)\Big\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Now we introduce the "many-to-one formula", which is by now a standard tool in the study of branching random walk, see for instance Lyons [29] for the probabilistic construction and Shi [36] for the complete references. Under assumption (1.1), there

exists a sequence of i.i.d. real-valued random variables $(S_i - S_{i-1},\, i \geq 0)$, with $S_0 = 0$, such that for any $n \geq 1$ and any Borel function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\mathbf{E}\Big[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}:\, |x|=n} g(V(x_i),\, 1 \leq i \leq n)\Big] = \mathbf{E}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{S_n}\, g(S_i,\, 1 \leq i \leq n)\Big], \tag{2.3}$$

where, for any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $|x| = n$, x_i $(0 \leq i \leq n)$ denotes the ancestor of x in the i-th generation.

Observe that by (1.1),

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(S_1\Big) = \mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{|u|=1} V(u)\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}\Big) = -\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i \log A_i\Big) > 0,$$

and if $1 < \kappa < \infty$, then by (1.2) and (1.4),

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\mathrm{e}^{-(\kappa-1)S_1}\Big) = 1, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{\delta S_1} + \mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-(\kappa-1+\delta)S_1} < \infty,$$

for some positive constant δ. We mention that $\kappa = \infty$ corresponds to the case where $\mathbf{E}\big(\mathrm{e}^{-tS_1}\big) < 1$ for any $t > 0$, which implies that $\mathbf{P}(S_1 \geq 0) = 1$.

We summarize some known results on the transient random walk (S_n) in the following fact:

Fact 2.2 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4).

(i) If $1 < \kappa < \infty$, *then*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_j} > r\Big) \asymp r^{-(\kappa-1)}, \qquad r \to \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

(ii) If $\kappa = \infty$, *then for any* $p > 0$, *there exists some constant* $c_p > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_j} > r\Big) \leq c_p\, r^{-p}, \qquad \forall\, r > 0. \tag{2.5}$$

We mention that (2.4) comes from Kesten [25] [the non-lattice case] and Grintsevichyus [17] [for the lattice case], and (2.5) follows easily from the triangular inequality: $\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_j}\|_p \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\mathrm{e}^{-S_j}\|_p = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \big(\|\mathrm{e}^{-S_1}\|_p\big)^j$, where $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the L^p-norm, and $\|\mathrm{e}^{-S_1}\|_p < 1$ since $\kappa = \infty$.

2.2 Change of measure for the edge local times

In this subsection we introduce a change of measure formula for the edge local times. This formula describes the law of the local times process under the annealed probability $\mathbb{P}$, and plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Recall (1.12). For any $k \geq 1$, let

$$\mathbb{T}^{(k)} := \{x \in \mathbb{T} : \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x) \geq 1\}, \tag{2.6}$$

be the subtree formed by the vertices visited at least once by the walk up to time $\overline{T}_k$. As proved by Aïdékon and de Raphélis ([1], Lemma 3.1), the marked tree $(\mathbb{T}^{(k)}, (\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x))_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(k)}})$ is a multi-type Galton-Watson tree with initial type k at the root (the type of a vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}^{(k)}$ is exactly the edge-local time $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)$). Applying [27] and [12], we get the following fact:

Fact 2.3 (change of measure for the edge-local times) *Assume* (1.1) *and* (1.2). *For any $k \geq 1$, on an eventually enlarged probability space we may define a probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k$, a distinguished infinite ray called spine $\{\mathtt{w}_i, i \geq 0\}$ and the tree $\mathbb{T}^{(k)}$ such that*

(i) for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k\Big(\mathtt{w}_n = x \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_n\Big) = \frac{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)}{\sum_{|y|=n} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y)}, \qquad \forall |x| = n,\ x \in \mathbb{T}^{(k)},$$

with $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), x \in \mathbb{T}^{(k)} : |x| \leq n\}$.

(ii) the marginal of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k$ on the space of trees is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k}{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}}\Big|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{|y|=n} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y), \qquad \forall\, n \geq 0.$$

(iii) under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k$, conditioned on $\sigma\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), \overleftarrow{x} \in \{\mathtt{w}_n, n \geq 0\}\}$, the processes $\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y), y \in \mathbb{T}_x^{(k)}\}_{\overleftarrow{x}\in\{\mathtt{w}_n, n\geq 0\}}$ are independent and are distributed as $\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(y), y \in \mathbb{T}_x^{(l)}\}$ with $l := \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)$, where $\mathbb{T}_x^{(k)}$ denotes the subtree of $\mathbb{T}^{(k)}$ rooted at x.

As a consequence of (i) and (ii), we get a many-to-one formula for the edge-local times. Let $n \geq 1$. For any $k \geq 1$ and measurable nonnegative function $f : \mathbb{N}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|x|=n} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x)\geq 1\}} f(\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x_1), \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x_2), ..., \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x_n))\Big] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_k\Big[\frac{k}{Y_n} f(Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n)\Big], \tag{2.7}$$

with

$$Y_n := \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(\mathtt{w}_n), \qquad n \geq 0. \tag{2.8}$$

The law of the process $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k$, is described in Subsection 6.1 of Aïdékon and de Raphélis [1]:

Fact 2.4 ([1]) *For any $k \geq 1$, under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k$, $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a positive recurrent Markov chain taking values in $\mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$, started at k, with transition probabilities given by*

$$P_{i,j} := C_{i+j-1}^{j-1}\, \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-(j-1)S_1}}{(1+\mathrm{e}^{-S_1})^{i+j}}\right), \qquad i,j \geq 1, \tag{2.9}$$

where the law of S_1 is given in (2.3)*. Moreover, the invariant probability measure $(\pi_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is given as follows:*

$$\pi_i := i\, \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_n}\right)^{i-1}}{\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_n}\right)^{i+1}}\right], \qquad i \geq 1. \tag{2.10}$$

By using (2.4) and (2.5), we get the asymptotic behaviors of the invariant probability measure π_i as $i \to \infty$: if $1 < \kappa < \infty$, then

$$\pi_i \asymp i^{-\kappa}, \qquad i \to \infty, \tag{2.11}$$

and if $\kappa = \infty$, then for any $p > 1$,

$$\sup_{i\geq 1} i^p\, \pi_i < \infty. \tag{2.12}$$

2.3 The random walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$

We collect some known results on the almost sure limits of the random walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ in the following fact:

Fact 2.5 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4)*. For any $\kappa \in (1,\infty]$, $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log n} \log \max_{0\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \;=\; 1 - \max(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\kappa}), \tag{2.13}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log n} \log L_n(\overleftarrow{\varnothing}) \;=\; \max(\frac{1}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{2}), \tag{2.14}$$

where $L_n(\overleftarrow{\varnothing}) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{\{X_i = \overleftarrow{\varnothing}\}}$.

We mention that (2.13) was proved in [22] under more restrictive assumptions (i.e. if ν equals some constant and $(A_1, ..., A_\nu)$ are i.i.d.), but the same argument still holds in the present case. The statement (2.14) was implicitly contained in [4, 22], see [20] for further studies on the local times.

Let us consider now the large deviations of the local times at a single vertex of the tree. Let $x \in \mathbb{T} \cup \{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}\}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} T_x &:= \inf\{n \geq 0 : X_n = x\}, \\ T_x^+ &:= \inf\{n \geq 1 : X_n = x\}, \end{aligned}$$

and we denote by $P_{x,\omega}$ the quenched probability under which the random walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ starts at x (so $P_\omega = P_{\varnothing,\omega}$). Observe that $\overline{T}_1 = T_{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}} + 1$, thus for any $x \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, we get

$$P_\omega\big(T_x < \overline{T}_1\big) = P_\omega\big(T_x < T_{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}}\big), \qquad P_{x,\omega}\big(\overline{T}_1 < T_x^+\big) = P_{x,\omega}\big(T_{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}} < T_x^+\big).$$

The probabilities $P_\omega\big(T_x < T_{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}}\big)$ and $P_{x,\omega}\big(T_{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}} < T_x^+\big)$ only involve the restriction at $\{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}\} \cup [\![\varnothing, x]\!]$ of the biased walk $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$, so a standard result for one-dimensional birth and death chains ([19], pp.31, formulae (59) and (60)) tells us that

$$P_\omega\big(T_x < \overline{T}_1\big) = \frac{1}{\sum_{z\in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}, \tag{2.15}$$

$$P_{x,\omega}\big(\overline{T}_1 < T_x^+\big) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z\in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}, \tag{2.16}$$

where $U(x)$ was defined in (2.1).

For any $x \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, the law of $L_{\overline{T}_n}(x)$ under P_ω is the law of $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$, where $(\xi_i,\, i \geq 1)$ are i.i.d. random variables with common law given as follows: $P_\omega(\xi_1 = 0) = 1 - a$ and $P_\omega(\xi_1 \geq k) = a\, p^{k-1}$, $\forall k \geq 1$, where

$$1 - p := P_{x,\omega}\{\overline{T}_1 < T_x^+\} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z\in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$a := P_\omega\{T_x < \overline{T}_1\} = \frac{1}{\sum_{z\in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}. \tag{2.18}$$

We shall use several times the following lemma which gives the tail estimate of $L_{\overline{T}_n}(x)$ under P_ω.

Lemma 2.6 *Let $0 < a < 1$ and $0 < p < 1$. Let $(\xi_i,\, i \geq 1)$ be an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with $\mathbf{P}(\xi_1 = 0) = 1 - a$ and $\mathbf{P}(\xi_1 \geq k) = a\, p^{k-1}$, $\forall k \geq 1$. Let $n, k \geq 2$. If $\frac{a}{1-p} < \frac{k}{8n}$, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i \geq k \Big\} \leq 6\, n\, a\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(1-p)k}{8}}\,.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.6. The above estimate was borrowed from [23] when $k = \lceil \varepsilon n \rceil$ with some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, indeed the same proof presented therein holds for all k satisfying $\frac{a}{1-p} < \frac{k}{8n}$, without any modification. □

We end this subsection by a useful relationship between the edge local times $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(\cdot)$ and the (site) local times $L_{\overline{T}_1}(\cdot)$:

$$L_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) + \sum_{y:\, \overleftarrow{y} = x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(y) = \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) + \Theta(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{T}, \tag{2.19}$$

where for the notational brevity, we write

$$\Theta(x) := \sum_{y:\, \overleftarrow{y} = x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(y), \qquad x \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{2.20}$$

For $x \in \mathbb{T}$, let $(x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(\nu_x)})$ be as before the set of the children of x. For any $0 \leq s_1, ..., s_i, ... \leq 1$, we have

$$E_\omega\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{\nu_x} (s_i)^{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x^{(i)})} \,\Big|\, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = k \Big) = \Big(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_x} (1 - s_i) A(x^{(i)}) \Big)^{-k}, \qquad \forall\, k \geq 1.$$

Then, for $0 \leq s \leq 1$,

$$E_\omega\Big(s^{\Theta(x)} \,\Big|\, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = k \Big) = \Big(1 + (1 - s) \sum_{y:\, \overleftarrow{y} = x} A(y) \Big)^{-k}, \tag{2.21}$$

which means that under P_ω and conditioned on $\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = k\}$,

$$\Theta(x) \overset{\text{(law)}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \eta_i, \tag{2.22}$$

where $(\eta_i, i \geq 1)$ are i.i.d. geometric variables with $P_\omega(\eta_1 \geq n) = \Big(\frac{\sum_{y:\, \overleftarrow{y} = x} A(y)}{1 + \sum_{y:\, \overleftarrow{y} = x} A(y)} \Big)^n$, for all $n \geq 0$. The identity (2.22) will be explored in Section 4.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1: Case $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$

The part (1.6) in Theorem 1.1 follows from a result which will also be useful for $\kappa \in (1, 2]$.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. We define an integer-valued random variable $K_\varepsilon(\omega)$ by

$$K_\varepsilon(\omega) := \begin{cases} \sup\left\{n \geq 1 : \min_{|x|=n} U(x) < \frac{8}{\varepsilon}\right\}, & \text{on } \{\mathbb{T} = \infty\}, \\ \max_{x \in \mathbb{T}} |x|, & \text{on } \{\mathbb{T} < \infty\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

By Lemma 2.1, $K_\varepsilon < \infty$, **P**-a.s. The following result holds for any $\kappa \in (1, \infty]$:

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\kappa \in (1, \infty]$. Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4). *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$. We have*

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) < \varepsilon, \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $q > 0$ denotes an arbitrary constant smaller than $\kappa - 1$ if $\kappa \in (1, \infty)$, and q denotes some (fixed) constant strictly larger than 1 if $\kappa = \infty$.

Consequently for any $0 < b < \max(\frac{q}{2}, \frac{q}{\kappa})$, we have

$$\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{j \geq n} \left\{\exists\, x \in \mathbb{T} : K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq j^b \text{ such that } x \in \mathbb{F}(j)\right\} = \emptyset, \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{3.3}$$

By admitting Proposition 3.1 for the moment, we immediately get (1.6):

Proof of (1.6) *in Theorem 1.1.* Let $\kappa \in (2, \infty]$. Then we may choose $q > 1$ so that (3.3) holds with some $b > \frac{1}{2}$. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. In view of (2.13), $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all large n, $\max_{0 \leq i \leq n} |X_i| \leq n^b$, hence

$$\limsup_{j \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{F}(j)} |x| \leq K_\varepsilon. \tag{3.4}$$

Now we notice that under P_ω, $(\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)})_{x \in \mathbb{T} \cup \{\overleftarrow{\varnothing}\}}$ is the invariant measure of the Markov chain (X_n). By applying the ergodic theorem for additive functionals of a recurrent Markov chain, we get that under P_ω, for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{L_n(\varnothing)} = \mathrm{e}^{-(U(x) - U(\varnothing))}.$$

It follows from (3.4) that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all large n,

$$\mathbb{F}(n) \subset \left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : U(x) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{T} : |y| \leq K_\varepsilon} U(y)\right\}.$$

Finally, we remark that $\min_{y \in \mathbb{T} : |y| \leq K_\varepsilon} U(y) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{T}} U(y)$ and get (1.6). □

It remains to give the proof of Proposition 3.1, whose main ingredient is contained in the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4). *Let* $\kappa \in (1,\infty]$. *For any small constant* $0<\delta<\kappa-1$, *there exists some constant* $c=c_\delta>0$ *such that for any* $k\geq 1$ *and* $r>1$,

$$\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}\exp\Big(-r\,\frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}\Big)\leq\begin{cases}c\,r^{-(\kappa-1-\delta)}, & \text{if } \kappa\in(1,\infty),\\ c\,r^{-1-\delta}, & \text{if } \kappa=\infty.\end{cases}\tag{3.5}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2: Let r be large. Denote by $H_r(x):=\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}\exp\big(-r\,\frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)}}\big)$. If $\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-U(x)}\leq\frac{r}{(\log r)^2}$ then $H_r(x)\leq\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}\mathrm{e}^{-(\log r)^2}$, hence

$$\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}H_r(x)1_{\{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-U(x)}\leq\frac{r}{(\log r)^2}\}}\leq\mathrm{e}^{-(\log r)^2}\,\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}=2\,\mathrm{e}^{-(\log r)^2},$$

where we used the fact that

$$\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}=\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}\mathrm{e}^{-V(x)}+\mathbf{E}\sum_{|y|=k+1}\mathrm{e}^{-V(y)}=2.$$

It remains to deal with the vertices $|x|=k$ such that $\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-U(x)}>\frac{r}{(\log r)^2}$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be small. Recall that $\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}=\mathrm{e}^{-V(x)}\frac{1}{\omega(x,\overleftarrow{x})}$. If $\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-V(x)}\in(r^{\varepsilon(j-1)},r^{\varepsilon j}]$ for some $1\leq j\leq\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, then $\frac{1}{\omega(x,\overleftarrow{x})}>r^{1-\varepsilon j}(\log r)^{-2}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}H_r(x)1_{\{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-U(x)}>\frac{r}{(\log r)^2}\}}\\
\leq\;&\sum_{j=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon\rceil}\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}1_{\{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-V(x)}\in(r^{\varepsilon(j-1)},r^{\varepsilon j}]\}}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}1_{\{\frac{1}{\omega(x,\overleftarrow{x})}>r^{1-\varepsilon j}(\log r)^{-2}\}}\\
&\quad+\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}1_{\{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-V(x)}>r\}}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}\\
=:\;&A_{(3.6)}+B_{(3.6)},
\end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

with obvious definitions of $A_{(3.6)}$ and $B_{(3.6)}$.

Observe that for any $k\geq 1$, conditioned on $\{V(z),|z|\leq k\}$, $\{1/\omega(x,\overleftarrow{x})\}_{|x|=k}$ are i.i.d. and are distributed as $1+\sum_{|u|=1}A(u)$ whose expectation is equal to 2. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{(3.6)}&=\mathbf{E}\sum_{|x|=k}1_{\{\sum_{z\in[\![\varnothing,x]\!]}\mathrm{e}^{V(z)-V(x)}>r\}}\mathrm{e}^{-V(x)}\times\mathbf{E}(1+\sum_{|u|=1}A(u))\\
&=2\,\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathrm{e}^{S_i-S_k}>r\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

by the many-to-one formula (2.3). Remark that for any $k \geq 1$ and any r,

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{e}^{S_i - S_k} > r\big) = \mathbf{P}\big(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathrm{e}^{-S_i} > r\big),$$

by the time-reversal of S. We choose and fix

$$\eta := \kappa - 1, \qquad \text{if } \kappa < \infty,$$

and we take an arbitrary constant $\eta > 1$ if $\kappa = \infty$. Applying (2.4) and (2.5), we get that for all large r, $\mathbf{P}\big(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-S_i} > r\big) \leq r^{-\eta}$; hence

$$B_{(3.6)} \leq 2\, r^{-\eta},$$

for all large r.

To deal with $A_{(3.6)}$, we remark by (1.4) that $c_\alpha := \mathbf{E}(\frac{1}{\omega(\varnothing, \overleftarrow{\varnothing})})^\alpha = \mathbf{E}\Big(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i\Big)^\alpha < \infty$ for some $\alpha > \kappa$ when $1 < \kappa < \infty$ and for some $\alpha > 2$ when $\kappa = \infty$. Therefore $\mathbf{E}(\frac{1}{\omega(\varnothing, \overleftarrow{\varnothing})} 1_{\{\frac{1}{\omega(\varnothing, \overleftarrow{\varnothing})} > t\}}) \leq c_\alpha\, t^{-(\alpha-1)}$ for any $t > 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(3.6)} &\leq c_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil} \mathbf{E} \sum_{|x|=k} 1_{\{\sum_{z \in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z) - V(x)} \in (r^{\varepsilon(j-1)}, r^{\varepsilon j}]\}} \mathrm{e}^{-V(x)} r^{-(\alpha-1)(1-\varepsilon j)} (\log r)^{2(\alpha-1)} \\ &= c_\alpha\, (\log r)^{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{\lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil} r^{-(\alpha-1)(1-\varepsilon j)}\, \mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{e}^{S_i - S_k} \in (r^{\varepsilon(j-1)}, r^{\varepsilon j}]\Big). \end{aligned}$$

As for $B_{(3.6)}$, we have by the time-reversal and the choice of η that

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{e}^{S_i - S_k} \in (r^{\varepsilon(j-1)}, r^{\varepsilon j}]\Big) \leq \mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathrm{e}^{-S_i} > r^{\varepsilon(j-1)}\Big) \leq r^{-\eta\, \varepsilon\, (j-1)}.$$

It follows that

$$A_{(3.6)} \leq c_\alpha\, \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil\, (\log r)^{2(\alpha-1)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq \lfloor 1/\varepsilon \rfloor} r^{-(\alpha-1)(1-\varepsilon j) - \eta\, \varepsilon\, (j-1)} \leq r^{-\min(\alpha-1, \eta) + O(\varepsilon)},$$

where $O(\varepsilon)$ denotes some quantity bounded by $c\, \varepsilon$ with some positive constant c depending on α, η. Since $O(\varepsilon)$ can be chosen as small as desired, we assemble the above estimates on $A_{(3.6)}$ and on $B_{(3.6)}$ and get (3.5). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. $\square$.

We are now ready to give the proof of Proposition 3.1:

Proof of Proposition 3.1. If $\kappa \in (1,2]$, for any $0 < q < \kappa - 1$, we choose a small constant $0 < \delta < \kappa - 1 - q$. If $\kappa \in (2,\infty]$, we choose $q := 1 + \frac{\delta}{2}$ with a small constant $\delta > 0$. For $|x| \geq K_\varepsilon$, we have $\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}$, therefore we can apply Lemma 2.6 and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_\omega\Big\{ \max_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \geq \lceil \varepsilon n \rceil \Big\} \\ \leq\ & 6 \sum_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q} \frac{n}{\sum_{z \in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}} \exp\Big(- \frac{\varepsilon n}{8} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z \in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}} \Big) \\ \leq\ & c_\varepsilon \sum_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q} \mathrm{e}^{-U(x)} \exp\Big(- \frac{\varepsilon n}{16} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{U(x)}}{\sum_{z \in [\![\varnothing, x]\!]} \mathrm{e}^{V(z)}} \Big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

by using the elementary inequality: $6\, r\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{8} r} \leq c_\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{16} r}$ for any $r > 0$. Taking the expectation of the right-hand side of (3.7), we deduce from (3.5) that for all large $n \geq n_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \max_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \geq \lceil \varepsilon n \rceil \Big\} \leq n^{-\varrho},$$

with some positive constant $\varrho > 0$. Consider $n_i := \lceil \mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{\log i}} \rceil$ for all large $i \geq i_0$. An application of Borel-Cantelli's lemma yields that

$$\limsup_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_i} \max_{K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq (n_i)^q} L_{\overline{T}_{n_i}}(x) \leq \varepsilon, \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

which in view of the monotonicity and the fact that $\frac{n_i}{n_{i-1}} \to 1$ impliy (3.2).

To get (3.3), we remark that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all large j, if n is the integer such that $\overline{T}_{n-1} \leq j < \overline{T}_n$, then $\mathbb{F}(j) \cap \{x : K_\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq n^q\} = \emptyset$. Indeed, otherwise for any x belonging to the intersection, $L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \geq L_j(x) \geq L_j(\varnothing) \geq n - 1$ which would contradict (3.2). By (2.14), $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for $\overline{T}_{n-1} \leq j < \overline{T}_n$, we have $n \geq j^{\max(1/\kappa, 1/2) + o(1)}$, implying (3.3). □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

This section is devoted to the study of the tail of the maximum of (edge) local times. At first we present several estimates on the Markov chain $(Y_n)_{n \geq 0}$ introduced in (2.8).

Let

$$\sigma_1^+ := \inf\{n \geq 1 : Y_n = 1\} \tag{4.1}$$

be the first return time of $(Y_n)_{n \geq 0}$ to 1. We estimate the maximum of an excursion of $(Y_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) *and* (1.4). *For any* $\kappa \in (1,\infty)$, *there are two numerical positive constants* $c_2 > c_1$ *such that for any* $r \geq 1$,

$$c_1\, r^{-(\kappa-1)} \leq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\Big) \leq c_2\, r^{-(\kappa-1)},$$

where we recall that under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1$, $Y_0 = 1$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. The upper bound follows from the asymptotic behaviors of the invariant probability $(\pi_i)_{i\geq 1}$. Let

$$\ell_Y(j) := \sum_{n=1}^{\sigma_1^+} 1_{\{Y_n = j\}}, \qquad j \geq 1, \tag{4.2}$$

be the local times of the Markov chain $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ up to σ_1^+. Then for any $r > 1$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\Big) \leq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\sum_{j=r}^{\infty} \ell_Y(j) \geq 1\Big) \leq \sum_{j=r}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1(\ell_Y(j)).$$

Since $(\pi_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is the invariant measure for the Markov Chain $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$, we obtain that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\big(\ell_Y(j)\big) = \frac{\pi_j}{\pi_1} \leq c\, j^{-\kappa}, \qquad \forall\, j \geq 1, \tag{4.3}$$

by applying (2.11) to get the above inequality. The upper bound follows.

For the lower bound, we use a representation of $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ in terms of a branching process in random environment (BPRE) with immigration: recalling $P_{i,j}$ from (2.9). For $0 < a < 1$, let $(\xi_{i,n}(a))_{i,n\geq 1}$ be a family of i.i.d. geometric random variables such that $\mathbf{P}(\xi_{1,1}(a) = n) = (1-a)\, a^n$ for all $n \geq 1$, and independent of $(S_n)_{n\geq 1}$. We observe that for any $i, j \geq 1$,

$$P_{i,j} = \mathbf{P}\Big(\xi_{1,1}(\mathtt{a}_1) + ... + \xi_{i+1,1}(\mathtt{a}_1) = j-1\Big),$$

with $\mathtt{a}_1 := \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-S_1}}{1+\mathrm{e}^{-S_1}}$. Let $\mathtt{a}_n := \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-(S_n - S_{n-1})}}{1+\mathrm{e}^{-(S_n-S_{n-1})}}$ for any $n \geq 2$. Define a process $(\widehat{Y}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ by induction: $\widehat{Y}_0 = 0$ and

$$\widehat{Y}_n := \sum_{k=1}^{\widehat{Y}_{n-1}+2} \xi_{k,n}(\mathtt{a}_n), \qquad n \geq 1.$$

Therefore the law of $(\widehat{Y}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ (under $\mathbf{P}$) is exactly the law of $(Y_n - 1)_{n\geq 0}$ under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1$, consequently

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\Big) = \mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \widehat{\sigma}_0} \widehat{Y}_n \geq r-1\Big),$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_0 := \inf\{n \geq 1 : \widehat{Y}_n = 0\}$. Remark that in each generation, there are two immigrants in $(\widehat{Y}_n)$, hence $\max_{1\leq n\leq \widehat{\sigma}_0} \widehat{Y}_n$ is stochastically larger than $\max_{n\geq 0} Z_n$, where Z is a BPRE started at 1 (without immigration and in the same environment $(\mathtt{a_n})_{n\geq 1}$). Conditioning on $(\mathtt{a_n})_{n\geq 1}$, Z_1 has the mean $\frac{\mathtt{a_1}}{1-\mathtt{a_1}} = \mathrm{e}^{-S_1}$. Observe that $\mathbf{E}\big(\mathrm{e}^{-(\kappa-1)S_1}\big) = 1$. Applying Afanasyev [2] gives that for some positive constant c,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{n\geq 0} Z_n > r\Big) \sim c\, r^{-(\kappa-1)}, \qquad r \to \infty.$$

It follows that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\big) \geq c_1 r^{-(\kappa-1)}$ for all $r \geq 1$. □

The following lemma gives a uniform estimate on the tail of $\max_{0\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n$ when Y_0 is an arbitrary integer:

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\kappa \in (1,\infty)$. Assume* (1.1), (1.2) *and* (1.4). *For any $0 < \gamma < \kappa - 1$, there exists some constant $c_\gamma > 0$ such that for all $l, r \geq 1$,*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l\Big(\max_{0\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\Big) = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l\Big(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+\Big) \leq c_\gamma \left(\frac{l}{r}\right)^\gamma,$$

where as before $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l$ means that the Markov chain $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ starts at l, and $\tau_r := \min\{n \geq 0 : Y_n \geq r\}$ is the first time that $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ exceeds the level r.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Fix $0 < \gamma < \kappa - 1$. Consider the function $f(i) := \frac{\Gamma(i+\gamma)}{\Gamma(i)}$ for $i \geq 1$. We mention that f is increasing and

$$f(i) \sim i^\gamma, \qquad i \to \infty.$$

We claim the existence of some integer $i_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$Pf(i) \leq f(i), \qquad \forall\, i \geq i_0, \tag{4.4}$$

where $P = (P_{i,j})_{i,j\geq 1}$ denotes the matrix transition of the Markov chain $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ under the probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l$. The proof of (4.4) is given in the Appendix.

Denote by $\sigma_F := \inf\{n \geq 0 : X_n \in F\}$ where $F := \{1, 2, ..., i_0\}$. Then by using (4.4), an application of the Markov property of $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ says that $f(Y_{n\wedge\sigma_F})$ is a supermartingale.

By the optional stopping theorem, we obtain that for any $r \geq l > i_0$,

$$f(l) \geq \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_l f(Y_{\sigma_F\wedge\tau_r}) \geq f(r)\, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\tau_r < \sigma_F).$$

It follows that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+) \leq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\tau_r < \sigma_F) + \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\sigma_F < \tau_r < \sigma_1^+) \leq \frac{f(l)}{f(r)} + \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\sigma_F < \tau_r < \sigma_1^+).$$

To estimate $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\sigma_F < \tau_r < \sigma_1^+)$, we apply the Markov property at σ_F:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\sigma_F < \tau_r < \sigma_1^+) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_l\Big(1_{\{\sigma_F < \tau_r \wedge \sigma_1^+\}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{Y_{\sigma_F}}(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+)\Big) \leq \max_{2\leq i\leq i_0} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_i(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+).$$

For any $i \in \{2, ..., i_0\}$ (and $r > i_0$),

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_i(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+) \leq \frac{1}{P_{1,i}}\, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+) = \frac{1}{P_{1,i}}\, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\max_{1\leq n\leq \sigma_1^+} Y_n \geq r\Big).$$

Applying the upper bound in Lemma 4.1 gives that there exists some constant $c_{i_0} > 0$ such that for any $i \in \{1, ..., i_0\}$, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_i(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+) \leq c_{i_0}\, r^{-(\kappa-1)}$ for all $r \geq 1$.

It follows that for all $l, r \geq 1$, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_l(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+) \leq \frac{f(l)}{f(r)} + c_{i_0}\, r^{-(\kappa-1)}$, which yields Lemma 4.2 because $f(i) \asymp i^\gamma$ for all $i \geq 1$. □.

Let $k \geq 1$, recall the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_k$ from (1.13). According to the terminology in [12], $\mathscr{Z}_k$ is an optional line for the multi-type Galton-Watson tree. For any $x \in \mathbb{T}^{(k)}$, recall that we denote by $x \leq \mathscr{Z}_k$ if for all $\varnothing < y < x$, $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(y) \geq 2$. The following lemma controls the distance of the line $\mathscr{Z}_k$ from the root $\varnothing$ when k is large:

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\kappa \in (1, \infty)$. Assume (1.1), (1.2) and (1.4). There is some positive constant c_3 such that $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely, for all large enough k,*

$$\max_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_k} |x| \leq c_3\, \log k. \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, there exists $(a_k)_{k\geq 0}$ an increasing deterministic sequence, $a_k \to \infty$, such that $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely, for all large enough k,

$$\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_k} |x| \geq a_k. \tag{4.6}$$

Remark 4.4 *Under some additional integrability assumption, for instance if there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^{-\delta}) < \infty$, then we may take $a_k = c \log k$ for some positive constant c in (4.6).*

Proof of Lemma 4.3. When $\kappa > 2$, (4.5) follows immediately from Lemma 7.2 in [1]. We mention that this Lemma 7.2 is also valid when $1 < \kappa \leq 2$. In fact, with the notations and the equality (5.6) therein, it is enough to remark that $P_{\mathbb{T}}(N_y^{(1)} \geq 1)^2 \leq P_{\mathbb{T}}(N_y^{(1)} \geq 1)^\beta$ with some $1 < \beta < \kappa \wedge 2$. Since $P_{\mathbb{T}}(N_y^{(1)} \geq 1) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-V(y)}$ and $\mathbf{E}\sum_{|y|=\ell/2} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta V(x)}$ decays exponentially fast in ℓ, (4.5) follows from an application of the convergence part of Borel-Cantelli's lemma.

To get (4.6), we first remark an elementary fact: for any sequence $(\xi_k)_{k\geq 1}$ such that $\xi_k \to \infty$ $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely, there exists some increasing deterministic sequence $a_k \to \infty$ such that $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely,

$$\xi_k \geq a_k, \tag{4.7}$$

for all large enough k. Indeed, defining $b_0 := 1$ and $b_i := \inf\{n > b_{i-1} : \mathbb{P}^*(\inf_{k\geq n} \xi_k < i) \leq i^{-2}\}$ for any $i \geq 1$, the Borel-Cantelli lemma yields that $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s., for all $\inf_{k\geq b_i} \xi_k \geq i$ for all large i. We define $a_k := \inf\{i \geq 0 : b_{i+1} \geq k\}$, which satisfies (4.7).

Now, observe that by hypothesis, $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely, every generation $\mathbb{T}$ is finite. Hence by the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_k$, $\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_k} |x| \to_{k\to\infty} \infty$ (as the second equation of Fact 4.7 ensures that $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s., $\mathscr{Z}_k$ is non-empty for k large enough). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.3. □

The following result estimates the maximum of edge local times up to the optional line $\mathscr{Z}_1$ ($\mathscr{Z}_1$ being defined in (1.13)):

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\kappa \in (1, \infty)$. Assume* (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) *and* (1.4). *There exist some positive constants c_4, c_5 such that for any $r \geq 1$,*

$$c_4\, r^{-\kappa} \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r \Big) \leq c_5\, r^{-\kappa}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Let $r > 1$. By considering the first generation n such that $\max_{|x|=n} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r \Big) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|x|=n} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\geq r,\, \max_{1\leq i<n} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_i)<r,\, \min_{1\leq i<n} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_i)\geq 2\}} \Big) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \left(\frac{1}{Y_n} 1_{\{Y_n\geq r,\, \max_{1\leq i<n} Y_i<r,\, \min_{1\leq i<n} Y_i\geq 2\}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

by using the many-to-one formula (2.7) for the edge local times. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r \Big) &\leq \frac{1}{r} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(Y_n \geq r,\, \max_{1\leq i<n} Y_i < r,\, \min_{1\leq i<n} Y_i \geq 2 \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{r}\, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\max_{1\leq i<\sigma_1^+} Y_i \geq r \Big),
\end{aligned}$$

by using the first return time $\sigma_1^+ := \min\{i \geq 1 : Y_i = 1\}$. By the upper bound of Lemma 4.1, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r \Big) \leq c_2\, r^{-\kappa}.$$

To get the lower bound, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} Z &:= \sum_{x\le \mathscr{Z}_1} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\ge r,\, \max_{\varnothing<y<x}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(y)<r\}} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{x:|x|=n} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\ge r,\, \max_{1\le i<n}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_i)<r,\, \min_{1\le i<n}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_i)\ge 2\}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the cardinal of the set of vertices which are the first of their ancestry line to have their edge local time to overshoot r. Remark that $\{Z\ge 1\}\subset\{\max_{x\le\mathscr{Z}_1}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\ge r\}$. We choose and fix $p>1$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \kappa<p<\min(\alpha,2), & \text{if } 1<\kappa<2,\\ p:=2, & \text{if } \kappa\ge 2, \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

where $\alpha>\kappa$ is the constant in the assumption (1.4). By the Paley-Zygmund inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(Z\ge 1\Big)\ge \frac{(\mathbb{E}(Z))^{p/(p-1)}}{(\mathbb{E}(Z^p))^{1/(p-1)}}. \tag{4.9}$$

First we estimate $\mathbb{E}(Z)$. It follows from the many-to-one formula (2.7) that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big(\frac{1}{Y_n}1_{\{\tau_r=n,\,\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}}\Big)=\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big(\frac{1}{Y_{\tau_r}}1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}}\Big),$$

where as in Lemma 4.2, $\tau_r=\min\{n\ge 0: Y_n\ge r\}$ denotes the first time that $(Y_n)_{n\ge 0}$ exceeds r. Applying the upper bound in Lemma 4.1 gives

$$\mathbb{E}(Z)\le c_2\, r^{-\kappa}.$$

On the other hand, by applying the lower bound in Lemma 4.1, we see that for some constant c large enough and for any $r\ge 1$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\tau_r<\sigma_1^+, Y_{\tau_r}\le cr\Big)=\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\Big)-\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\tau_{cr}<\sigma_1^+\Big)\ge c_1 r^{-\kappa}-c_2(cr)^{-\kappa}\ge c_6 r^{-\kappa}.$$

Hence $\mathbb{E}(Z)\ge (cr)^{-1}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\big(\tau_r<\sigma_1^+, Y_{\tau_r}\le cr\big)\ge \frac{c_6}{c}\, r^{-\kappa}$. Consequently we have proved that

$$c_7\, r^{-\kappa}\le \mathbb{E}(Z)\le c_2\, r^{-\kappa},\qquad \forall r\ge 1. \tag{4.10}$$

Now we estimate the p-th moment of Z by using the change of measure formula in Fact 2.3. At first, we recall the definition of $\mathbb{T}^{(1)}$ in (2.6) and introduce the following optional line (in the sense of Biggins and Kyprianou [12]):

$$\mathscr{L}_r:=\Big\{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(1)}: \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\ge r,\ \max_{\varnothing<y<x}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(y)<r\Big\},\qquad r>1,$$

the set of vertices which are the first on the ancestry line to have an edge local time exceeding r. Recall the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_1$ from (1.13). We remark that for any $r > 1$,

$$Z = \sum_{x \in \mathscr{L}_r} 1_{\{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}}.$$

A standard argument in the studies of branching random walk, see for instance Biggins and Kyprianou [12], shows that we may replace the set $\{|x| = n\}$ by an optional line $\mathscr{L}_r$, and the corresponding change of measure formula in Fact 2.3 still holds (with obvious modifications). Write $x \sim \mathtt{w}_i$ iff $\overleftarrow{x} = \mathtt{w}_{i-1}$ and $x \neq \mathtt{w}_i$ for any $i \geq 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big(Z^p\Big) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\frac{1}{Y_{\tau_r}} 1_{\{\mathtt{w}_{\tau_r} \leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}} \Big(\sum_{x \in \mathscr{L}_r} 1_{\{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}}\Big)^{p-1}\Big] \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\frac{1}{Y_{\tau_r}} 1_{\{\tau_r < \sigma_1^+\}} \Big(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r} \sum_{x \sim \mathtt{w}_i} Z^{(x)}\Big)^{p-1}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where for any $x \sim \mathtt{w}_i$,

$$Z^{(x)} := \sum_{y \in \mathscr{L}_r, y \geq x} 1_{\{y \leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}}.$$

Let $\mathcal{Y} := \sigma\{Y_i, \mathtt{w}_i, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x), x \sim \mathtt{w}_i, i \leq \tau_r\}$ be the σ-fields generated by the spine up to τ_r. By the choice of p in (4.8), $0 < p - 1 \leq 1$, and it follows that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\Big(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r} \sum_{x \sim \mathtt{w}_i} Z^{(x)}\Big)^{p-1} \big| \mathcal{Y}\Big] \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r} \Big(\sum_{x \sim \mathtt{w}_i} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\big[Z^{(x)} \,|\, \mathcal{Y}\big]\Big)^{p-1}. \tag{4.12}$$

Notice that by the branching property outside the spine $(\mathtt{w}_i)$, on the event $\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = l\}$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\big[Z^{(x)} \,|\, \mathcal{Y}\big] = \mathbb{E}(Z_l),$$

where $Z_0 := 0$ and

$$Z_l := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}^{(l)}} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(x) \geq r,\, \max_{\varnothing < y < x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(y) < r,\, \min_{\varnothing < y < x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(y) \geq 2\}}, \qquad l \geq 1.$$

By applying (2.7) and then Lemma 4.2 , we get that for any $\beta \in [1, \kappa)$, there exists some constant $c_\beta > 1$ such that for all $r \geq l \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_l) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_l\Big(\frac{l}{Y_{\tau_r}} 1_{\{\tau_r < \sigma_1^+\}}\Big) \leq c_\beta \left(\frac{l}{r}\right)^\beta. \tag{4.13}$$

Going back to (4.11), we deduce from (4.12) and (4.13) that for any $1 \le \beta < \kappa$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Z^p) &\le \frac{1}{r}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\Big(\tau_r < \sigma_1^+\Big) + (c_\beta)^{p-1}\,\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\frac{1}{Y_{\tau_r}} 1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r}\Big(\sum_{x\sim \mathtt{w}_i}\big(\frac{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)}{r}\big)^\beta\Big)^{p-1}\Big] \\
&\le c_2\, r^{-\kappa} + c_{\beta,p}\, r^{-1-\beta(p-1)}\,\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r}\Big(\sum_{x\sim \mathtt{w}_i}\big(\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\big)^\beta\Big)^{p-1}\Big] \\
&\le c_2\, r^{-\kappa} + c_{\beta,p}\, r^{-1-\beta(p-1)}\,\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r}\Big(\sum_{x\sim \mathtt{w}_i}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\Big)^{\beta(p-1)}\Big], \qquad (4.14)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the upper bound of Lemma 4.1 for the second inequality.

Now we choose (and fix) a constant β such that

$$\begin{cases} \beta := 1, & \text{if } 1<\kappa<2, \\ \kappa - 1 < \beta < \min(\alpha-1, \kappa), & \text{if } \kappa \ge 2, \end{cases} \qquad (4.15)$$

Let us admit for the moment the existence of some positive constant c such that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\Big(\sum_{x\sim \mathtt{w}_i}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\Big)^{\beta(p-1)} \,\Big|\, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(\mathtt{w}_{i-1}) = l\Big] \le c\, l^{\beta(p-1)}, \qquad \forall l \ge 1. \qquad (4.16)$$

Therefore we deduce from (4.14) that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z^p) \le c_2\, r^{-\kappa} + c'\, r^{-1-\beta(p-1)}\,\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big(1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r}(Y_{i-1})^{\beta(p-1)}\Big).$$

By using the local time process $\ell_Y(\cdot)$ of $(Y_n)_{n\ge0}$ defined in (4.2), we get that (recalling that $\pi_j \asymp j^{-\kappa}$ and noticing that $\beta(p-1) > \kappa - 1$, by the choices of p in (4.8) and of β in (4.15))

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big(1_{\{\tau_r<\sigma_1^+\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_r}(Y_{i-1})^{\beta(p-1)}\Big) \le \sum_{j=1}^{r} j^{\beta(p-1)}\,\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1(\ell_Y(j)) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} j^{\beta(p-1)}\,\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_1} \le c\, r^{\beta(p-1)-\kappa+1}.$$

Consequently

$$\mathbb{E}(Z^p) \le c''\, r^{-\kappa},$$

which in view of (4.9) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\le \mathscr{Z}_1}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \ge r\Big) \ge \mathbb{P}(Z \ge 1) \ge c_8\, r^{-\kappa}, \qquad r \ge 1.$$

This proves the lower bound of Lemma 4.5.

It remains to check (4.16). According to Fact 2.3, the expectation term in the left-hand-side of (4.16) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_l\Big(\sum_{|x|=1:x\sim \mathtt{w}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(x)\Big)^{\beta(p-1)} &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{l}\sum_{|x|=1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(x)\Big(\sum_{y:|y|=1,y\neq x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(y)\Big)^{\beta(p-1)}\Big]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{l}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|x|=1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(x)\Big)^{1+\beta(p-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

We shall use an application of Hölder's inequality: $(\sum_{i=1}^l t_i)^{1+\beta(p-1)} \leq l^{\beta(p-1)} \sum_{i=1}^l t_i^{1+\beta(p-1)}$ for any $t_i \geq 0$. Observe that under $\mathbb{P}$, $\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(\cdot) - \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_{l-1}}(\cdot)\}_{l\geq 1}$ are identically distributed (but not independent). It follows that

$$\frac{1}{l}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|x|=1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_l}(x)\Big)^{1+\beta(p-1)} \leq l^{\beta(p-1)}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|x|=1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\Big)^{1+\beta(p-1)} = l^{\beta(p-1)}\mathbb{E}\Big(\Theta(\varnothing)\Big)^{1+\beta(p-1)},$$

by using the notation in (2.20). Then to check (4.16) it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{E}\big(\Theta(\varnothing)\big)^{1+\beta(p-1)} < \infty$. By (2.22) (with $x = \varnothing$ and $k = 1$ there), we get that

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\Theta(\varnothing)\big)^{1+\beta(p-1)} = \mathbf{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{1+\beta(p-1)}\,\Big(\frac{\sum_{|y|=1} A(y)}{1+\sum_{|y|=1} A(y)}\Big)^n\,\frac{1}{1+\sum_{|y|=1} A(y)}.$$

Elementary computations say that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{1+\beta(p-1)}\,\big(\frac{t}{1+t}\big)^n \leq c_\beta\,(1+t)^{2+\beta(p-1)}$ for any $t > 0$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\Theta(\varnothing)\big)^{1+\beta(p-1)} \leq c_\beta\,\mathbf{E}\Big(1+\sum_{|y|=1} A(y)\Big)^{1+\beta(p-1)},$$

which is finite according to the assumption (1.4) (recalling that $1+\beta(p-1) < \alpha$). This implies (4.16) and completes the proof of Lemma 4.5. □

Let us consider now the maximum of the (site) local times $L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ instead of the edge local times $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$:

Lemma 4.6 *Assume* (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) *and* (1.4). *There exist some positive constants* c_9, c_{10} *such that for any* $r \geq 1$,

$$c_9\,r^{-\kappa} \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \geq r\Big) \leq c_{10}\,r^{-\kappa}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.6. In view of the lower bound in Lemma 4.5, it is enough to prove the upper bound in Lemma 4.6.

Recall (2.19) and (2.20). By applying Lemma 2.6 to (2.22), we get that for any $r > 1$, $k \geq 1$, if $\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y) \leq \frac{1}{8}\frac{r}{k}$, then

$$P_\omega\Big(\Theta(x) \geq r \big| \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = k\Big) \leq 6\, k\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y))}}. \tag{4.17}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_\omega\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \Theta(x) \geq r\Big) \\ \leq\ & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|x|=n} E_\omega\Big[1_{\{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}}\Big(6\,\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y))}} + 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) > \frac{r}{8\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y)}\}}\Big)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Observe that the event $\{x \leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}$ and the variable $\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ only involve those environments which are independent of $\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y)$. Moreover $\sum_{y:\overleftarrow{y}=x} A(y)$ is distributed as $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i$. By taking the expectation with respect to the environment, we deduce from (4.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \Theta(x) \geq r\Big) \\ \leq\ & \int \mathbf{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i \in \mathrm{d}t) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|x|=n} 1_{\{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1\}}\Big(6\,\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(\overleftarrow{x})\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+t)}} + 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(\overleftarrow{x}) > \frac{r}{8t}\}}\Big)\Big] \\ =\ & \int \mathbf{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i \in \mathrm{d}t) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\frac{1_{\{n\leq \sigma_1^+\}}}{Y_n}\Big(6Y_n\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+t)}} + 1_{\{Y_n > \frac{r}{8t}\}}\Big)\Big], \end{aligned}$$

by using the many-to-one formula (2.7) and the notation σ_1^+ in (4.1). Since the Markov Chain $(Y_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is positive recurrent, $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1(\sigma_1^+) < \infty$. This together with (4.2) and (4.3) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\Big[\frac{1_{\{n\leq \sigma_1\}}}{Y_n}\Big(6Y_n\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+t)}} + 1_{\{Y_n > \frac{r}{8t}\}}\Big)\Big] &\leq c\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+t)}} + \sum_{j>r/(8t)} \frac{1}{j}\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1(\ell_Y(j)) \\ &\leq c\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+t)}} + c\,r^{-\kappa}\,t^{\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \Theta(x) \geq r\Big) \leq c\,\mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i)}} + c\,r^{-\kappa}\,\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i\Big)^{\kappa}.$$

If we introduce an independent standard exponential variable $\mathbf{e}$, then $\mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r}{8(1+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i)}} = \mathbf{P}\big((1+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i) > \frac{r}{8\mathbf{e}}\big) \leq c'\,\mathbf{E}\big(\frac{r}{8\mathbf{e}}\big)^{-\kappa} = c'\,r^{-\kappa}\,\mathbf{E}(8\mathbf{e})^{\kappa}$, with $c' := \mathbf{E}(1+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i)^{\kappa} < \infty$ by assumption. Then we get that $\mathbb{P}\big(\max_{x\leq \mathscr{Z}_1} \Theta(x) \geq r\big) \leq c''\,r^{-\kappa}$, which in view of (2.19) and Lemma 4.5 complete the proof of Lemma 4.6. □

Recall the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_1$ in (1.13). We are interested in the number of vertices in this optional line $\mathscr{Z}_1$.

Fact 4.7 ([1],[13]) *Assume* (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) *and* (1.4). *For any* $\kappa \in (1,2]$, *we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1 > r\Big) \asymp r^{-\kappa}, \qquad \forall\, r \geq 1, \tag{4.19}$$

and if $\kappa > 2$, *then*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1\big)^2\Big] < \infty. \tag{4.20}$$

Moreover if $\kappa \in (1,2]$, *as* $l \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\#\mathscr{Z}_l}{l} \quad \stackrel{L^p(\mathbb{P}^*)}{\longrightarrow} W_\infty,$$

for any $1 \leq p < \kappa$, *where* W_∞ *denotes the limit of the additive martingale* $W_n := \sum_{|x|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-V(x)}$, *which is positive* $\mathbb{P}^*$*-a.s.*

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.5:

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We prove first the estimates on the edge local times $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$. By the strong Markov property, we get the following identity in law under the annealed probability measure $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \stackrel{(\mathrm{law})}{=} \max\Big(\max_{x\leq\mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x),\ \max_{1\leq i\leq \#\mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}^{*,i}\Big),$$

where $\overline{L}^{*,i}, i \geq 1$, are i.i.d. copies of $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$, independent of $(\max_{x\leq\mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x), \#\mathscr{Z}_1)$. Write $a_r := \mathbb{P}(\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) > r)$ for all $r \geq 0$ and $\ell^* := \max_{x\leq\mathscr{Z}_1} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ for notational brevity. We get from the above identity in law that for all $r > 0$,

$$a_r = 1 - \mathbb{E}\Big(1_{\{\ell^*\leq r\}}(1-a_r)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\Big) = 1 - \mathbb{E}\Big((1-a_r)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\Big) + \mathbb{E}\Big(1_{\{\ell^*> r\}}(1-a_r)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\Big).$$

Define a function f by

$$f(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon - 1 + \mathbb{E}\Big((1-\varepsilon)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\Big), \qquad 0 < \varepsilon < 1.$$

Then we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(1_{\{\ell^*> r\}}(1-a_r)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\Big) = f(a_r). \tag{4.21}$$

Note that $1 - \mathbb{E}\big((1-\varepsilon)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\big) = \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^\infty (1-\varepsilon)^{j-1} \mathbb{P}\big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1 \geq j\big)$. Note that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}\big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1 \geq j\big) = \mathbb{E}(\#\mathscr{Z}_1) = 1$. In fact, by the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_1$ in (1.13) and by applying the many-to-one formula (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\#\mathscr{Z}_1) &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|x|=n} 1_{\{\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_1)\geq 2,\ldots,\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_{n-1})\geq 2, \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_n)=1\}}\Big) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_1\big(\frac{1}{Y_n} 1_{\{Y_1\geq 2,\ldots,Y_{n-1}\geq 2, Y_n=1\}}\big) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1(Y_1 \geq 2, \ldots, Y_{n-1} \geq 2, Y_n = 1) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$f(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1-(1-\varepsilon)^{j-1}) \mathbb{P}\big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1 \geq j\big), \qquad 0<\varepsilon<1.$$

Based on (4.19) and (4.20), it is elementary to check that[4] as $\varepsilon \to 0$,

$$f(\varepsilon) \asymp \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{\kappa}, & \text{if } 1<\kappa<2, \\ \varepsilon^2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{if } \kappa = 2, \\ \varepsilon^2, & \text{if } 2<\kappa<\infty. \end{cases} \tag{4.22}$$

For the upper bound of $\mathbb{P}(\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x) > r) \equiv a_r$, we use the equality (4.21) to see that $f(a_r) \leq \mathbb{P}\big(\ell^* > r\big) \leq c_5\, r^{-\kappa}$ by Lemma 4.5, and the corresponding upper bound for a_r follows immediately from (4.22).

To get the lower bound of a_r, we remark that for r large enough (such that $a_r \leq 1/2$),

$$f(a_r) = \mathbb{E}\big(1_{\{\ell^*>r\}}(1-a_r)^{\#\mathscr{Z}_1}\big) \geq c\,\mathbb{P}\Big(\ell^* > r, \#\mathscr{Z}_1 \leq \frac{1}{a_r}\Big),$$

with $c := \inf_{0<\varepsilon<\frac{1}{2}} (1-\varepsilon)^{1/\varepsilon} > 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\ell^* > r\Big) \leq \frac{1}{c} f(a_r) + \mathbb{P}\Big(\#\mathscr{Z}_1 > \frac{1}{a_r}\Big) \leq \begin{cases} c'\,(a_r)^{\kappa}, & \text{if } 1<\kappa<2, \\ c'\,(a_r)^2 \log \frac{1}{a_r}, & \text{if } \kappa = 2, \\ c'\,(a_r)^2, & \text{if } 2<\kappa<\infty, \end{cases}$$

by using (4.22), (4.19) and (4.20). By Lemma 4.5, $\mathbb{P}\big(\ell^* > r\big) \geq c_1 r^{-\kappa}$, which gives the lower bound of a_r.

To deal with the local times instead of the edge-local times $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$, we remark that again by the Markov property, under the annealed probability measure $\mathbb{P}$,

$$\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x) \overset{(\text{law})}{=} \max\Big(\max_{x\leq\mathscr{Z}_1} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x),\ \max_{1\leq i\leq \#\mathscr{Z}_1} \widehat{L}^{*,i}\Big),$$

where $\widehat{L}^{*,i}, i\geq 1$, are i.i.d. copies of $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$, independent of $(\max_{x\leq\mathscr{Z}_1} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x), \#\mathscr{Z}_1)$.

The rest of the proof goes exactly in the same way as that for the edge-local times, by applying Lemma 4.6 instead of Lemma 4.5. □

[4]The cases $1<\kappa\leq 2$ follow from an application of Tauberian theorem. Let us give the details when $\kappa>2$: Using the fact that $1-(1-\varepsilon)^{j-1} \leq \varepsilon(j-1)$, we get that $f(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(j-1)1_{\{j\leq\#\mathscr{Z}_1\}} \leq \varepsilon^2\,\mathbb{E}[(\#\mathscr{Z}_1)^2]$, implying the upper bound on $f(\varepsilon)$. For the lower bound, we use the inequality that $1-(1-\varepsilon)^{j-1} \geq \varepsilon(j-1)(1-\varepsilon)^{j-1}$ and get that $\frac{f(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(j-1)(1-\varepsilon)^{j-1}1_{\{j\leq\#\mathscr{Z}_1\}} \to \mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(j-1)1_{\{j\leq\#\mathscr{Z}_1\}}$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$ by the monotone convergence, and the lower bound on $f(\varepsilon)$ follows.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1: Case $1 < \kappa \leq 2$

5.1 Proofs of (1.8) and (1.9), case $1 < \kappa < 2$

Proposition 5.1 *Let $1 < \kappa < 2$. Assume (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4). Then $\mathbb{P}^*$-almost surely,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_n}(x) = \infty.$$

We shall use several times the following fact in the proof of Proposition 5.1:

Fact 5.2 ([37], Chapter VII, Corollary 1) *Let $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ be a sequence of random variables adapted to some filtration $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i\geq 0}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely, $0 \leq \xi_i \leq 1$ for any $i \geq 1$. Then*

$$\Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \xi_i = \infty \Big\} = \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\big(\xi_i | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}\big) = \infty \Big\}, \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-}a.s.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Let K be a large constant and $\varepsilon > 0$ be small. Choose an increasing subsequence $n_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$ such that

$$a_{n_j} > n_{j-1}, \tag{5.1}$$

where the (deterministic) sequence (a_k) is as in (4.6). Recall the definition of $\mathscr{Z}_k$ for $k \geq 1$ from (1.13). Define for any $j \geq 1$,

$$B_j := \Big\{ \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_{n_j}}(x) \geq K\, n_j, \max_{0\leq i\leq \overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}} |X_i| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j} \geq \varepsilon n_j \Big\}.$$



Figure 2: The event B_j (in red).

Recall the definition of $\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}$ from (2.6). Remark that $\max_{0\le i\le \overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}} |X_i| = \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}} |x|$. Then B_j is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{G}_j$ defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{G}_j := \sigma\Big(\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), 1 \le k \le n_j,\, x \in \mathbb{T}^{(n_j)}\Big), \qquad j \ge 1.$$

For any $x \in \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$, let

$$\zeta_x := \max_{y\in\mathbb{T}, y\ge x} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_{n_j}}(y). \tag{5.2}$$

Then for any event $A \in \mathcal{G}_{j-1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(B_j \cap A\Big) \ge \mathbb{E}\Big(1_{A\cap\{\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}} |x| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\ge\varepsilon n_j\}}\big(1 - \prod_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} 1_{\{\zeta_x < Kn_j\}}\big)\Big).$$

Define $\mathcal{G}_j^* := \sigma\Big(\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), 1 \le k \le n_j,\, x \in \mathbb{T}^{(n_j)}, x \le \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\Big)$ which is a σ-field smaller than $\mathcal{G}_j$. Remark that $A \cap \{\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}} |x| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|\}$ is $\mathcal{G}_j^*$-measurable, as well as $\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$. On the other hand, the process $(\mathbb{T}^{(n_j)}, (\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_k}(x), 1 \le k \le n_j)_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_j)}})$ is again a multi-type Galton-Watson tree; then we may apply the branching property to see that conditioned on $\mathcal{G}_j^*$, $(\zeta_x)_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}$ are i.i.d. and are distributed as $\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z)$, see e.g. Jagers [24], Theorem 3.1 for the justification of the use of branching property along an optional line. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(B_j \cap A) &\ge \mathbb{E}\Big(1_{A\cap\{\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}} |x| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\ge\varepsilon n_j\}}\big(1 - \prod_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} \mathbb{P}(\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z) < Kn_j)\big)\Big) \\
&\ge \big(1 - \mathbb{P}(\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z) < Kn_j)^{\varepsilon n_j}\big)\, \mathbb{P}\Big(A \cap \{\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}} |x| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|,\, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j} \ge \varepsilon n_j\}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1.5,

$$1-\mathbb{P}(\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z)<Kn_j)^{\varepsilon n_j}\ge 1-(1-\frac{c}{Kn_j})^{\varepsilon n_j}\ge c_{\varepsilon,K},$$

with some positive constant $c_{\varepsilon,K}$ only depending on ε and K. Thus we have proved that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(B_j\,|\,\mathcal{G}_{j-1}\Big)\ge c_{\varepsilon,K}\,\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|<\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}|x|,\,\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\ge\varepsilon n_j\big|\mathcal{G}_{j-1}\Big),\tag{5.3}$$

where we have used again the fact that $\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|=\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^{(n_{j-1})}}|x|$.

By Fact 2.5 (combining (2.13) with (2.14)), we easily get that $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s. for all large j, $\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|\le n_{j-1}^{\kappa-1+o(1)}<n_{j-1}$ for all large j [here $\kappa<2$]. Notice that $n_{j-1}<a_{n_j}$ which is in turn smaller than $\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}|x|$ by (4.6). Hence $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s. for all large j,

$$\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|<\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}|x|.$$

To treat $\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$, we apply Fact 4.7 and see that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty}\frac{\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}{n_j}\ge W_\infty,\qquad\mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.}$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{W_\infty>\varepsilon\}$,

$$\sum_j 1_{\{\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|<\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}|x|,\,\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\ge\varepsilon n_j\}}=\infty.$$

Applying Fact 5.2 gives that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{W_\infty>\varepsilon\}$,

$$\sum_j\mathbb{P}\big(\max_{0\le i\le\overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}}|X_i|<\min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}|x|,\,\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}\ge\varepsilon n_j\big|\mathcal{G}_{j-1}\big)=\infty,$$

which, again in view of Fact 5.2 and (5.3), yields that $\sum_j 1_{B_j}=\infty$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{W_\infty>\varepsilon\}$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}}\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_n}(x)\ge K$. Recall that $\{\mathbb{T}=\infty\}=\{W_\infty>0\}=\bigcup_{\varepsilon>0}\{W_\infty>\varepsilon\}$. Letting $K\to\infty$, we get Proposition 5.1. □

Now we are ready to give the proofs of (1.8) and (1.9) in Theorem 1.1 for the case $1<\kappa<2$:

Proof of (1.8) *in Theorem 1.1.* Remark that for any $x\in\mathbb{T}$, $E_\omega(L_{\overline{T}_1}(x))=\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}$. By the law of large numbers we see that for any fixed $K\ge 1$, P_ω-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\max_{|x|\le K}L_{\overline{T}_n}(x)=\max_{|x|\le K}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}\le\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}<\infty,$$

by Lemma 2.1. In view of Proposition 5.1 we get that $\mathbb{P}^*$-a.s.,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)} |x| \ge K.$$

The above limsup equals in fact infinity because K can be chosen arbitrarily large. This together with (3.3) imply (1.8). □

Proof of (1.9) *in Theorem 1.1.* Let $A > 1$ be a large constant. Recall the definition of ζ_x from (5.2). Define for any $j \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &:= \Big\{ \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}: x\ge \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} L_{\overline{T}_{n_j}}(x) \le \frac{n_j}{2}, \max_{0\le i\le \overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}} |X_i| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j} \le A\, n_j \Big\} \\ &= \Big\{ \max_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} \zeta_x \le \frac{n_j}{2}, \max_{0\le i\le \overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}} |X_i| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j} \le A\, n_j \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where n_j and ζ_x are defined in (5.1) and (5.2) respectively, and we denote by $x \ge \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$ if there exists $y \in \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$ such that $y \le x$. The same argument as that in the proof of Proposition 5.1 (with the same $\mathcal{G}_j$ as there) yields that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(C_j \,\Big|\mathcal{G}_{j-1}\Big) \ge \mathbb{P}\big(\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z) < \frac{n_j}{2}\big)^{A\,n_j}\, \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{0\le i\le \overline{T}_{n_{j-1}}} |X_i| < \min_{x\in\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} |x|,\, \#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j} \le A\, n_j \Big|\mathcal{G}_{j-1}\Big).$$

Applying Theorem 1.5 to $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ gives that $\mathbb{P}\big(\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z) < \frac{n_j}{2}\big)^{A\,n_j} \ge c_A$ with some positive constant c_A. By Fact 4.7,

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \frac{\#\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}}{n_j} \le W_\infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.}$$

Therefore $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{W_\infty < A\}$, $\sum_j 1_{C_j} = \infty$, which implies that there are infinitely many $j \to \infty$ such that $\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}: x\ge\mathscr{Z}_{n_j}} L_{\overline{T}_{n_j}}(x) \le \frac{n_j}{2} < L_{\overline{T}_{n_j}}(\varnothing)$, a fortiori, any favorite site $x \in \mathbb{F}(\overline{T}_{n_j})$ must satisfy that $x < \mathscr{Z}_{n_j}$. By (4.5), $|x| \le c_3 \log n_j$ which by (2.14), is in turn smaller than $(\overline{T}_{n_j})^b$ for any contant $b \in (0, \frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa})$ for all j large enough. In view of (3.3), we conclude that for those $j \to \infty$, any favorite site $x \in \mathbb{F}(\overline{T}_{n_j})$ must satisfy that $|x| \le K_\varepsilon$ for any fixed $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{W_\infty < A\}$, $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \max_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)} |x| \le K_\varepsilon$, yielding (1.9) by letting $A \to \infty$. □

5.2 Proof of (1.7): Case $\kappa = 2$

First we remark that by (3.2) and the upper bound (4.5) in Lemma 4.3, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{|x|\ge K_\varepsilon,\, x\le \mathscr{Z}_n} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) < \varepsilon, \qquad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.}, \tag{5.4}$$

Hence for any $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some integer $n_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}^*\Big(\max_{|x| \geq K_\varepsilon,\, x \leq \mathscr{Z}_n} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \leq 2\varepsilon n \Big) \geq 1 - \delta. \tag{5.5}$$

Now we recall from [20] that when $\kappa = 2$, as $j \to \infty$,

$$\frac{L_j(\overleftarrow{\varnothing})}{\sqrt{j \log j}} \stackrel{(\text{law})}{\longrightarrow} \text{ a non-degenerate distribution on } (0, \infty) \text{ under } \mathbb{P}^*. \tag{5.6}$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$, there is a sufficiently small constant $c_\delta > 0$ such that for all large $j \geq j_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}^*\Big(n_1 \leq L_j(\overleftarrow{\varnothing}) \leq n_2 \Big) \geq 1 - \delta, \tag{5.7}$$

where $n_1 \equiv n_1(j) := \lceil c_\delta \sqrt{j \log j} \rceil$ and $n_2 \equiv n_2(j) := \lceil \frac{1}{c_\delta} \sqrt{j \log j} \rceil$. Observe that by the Markov property, for each $n \geq 1$, the following identity in law holds under the annealed probability measure $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\max_{x \geq \mathscr{Z}_n} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \stackrel{(\text{law})}{=} \max_{1 \leq i \leq \# \mathscr{Z}_n} \widehat{L}^{*,i},$$

where $\widehat{L}^{*,i}, i \geq 1$, are i.i.d. copies of $\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}} L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$, independent of $\# \mathscr{Z}_n$. Choose and fix $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{c_\delta^2}{4}$. It follows from the tail estimate in Theorem 1.5 (with $\kappa = 2$) that for all large $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{x \geq \mathscr{Z}_n} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \geq \varepsilon n \Big) &\leq 1 - \mathbb{E}\Big(1 - \frac{c}{\varepsilon n \sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}} \Big)^{\# \mathscr{Z}_n} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \frac{c \, \# \mathscr{Z}_n}{\varepsilon n \sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}} \\ &\leq c_\varepsilon \, (\log n)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

by applying Fact 4.7 to get the last inequality. In particular for all large n,

$$\mathbb{P}^*\Big(\max_{x \geq \mathscr{Z}_n} L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \geq \varepsilon n \Big) \leq \delta.$$

Let j be large. On the event of the probability term in (5.7), we have $\overline{T}_{n_1} \leq j \leq \overline{T}_{n_2}$. If there is some $x \in \mathbb{F}(j)$ such that $|x| > K_\varepsilon$, then $L_j(x) \geq L_j(\varnothing)$, which implies that $L_{\overline{T}_{n_2}}(x) \geq L_{\overline{T}_{n_1}}(\varnothing) \geq n_1 > 2\,\varepsilon\, n_2$ by the choice of ε. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\{ \max_{x \in \mathbb{F}(j)} |x| > K_\varepsilon \Big\} \cap \Big\{ n_1 \leq L_j(\overleftarrow{\varnothing}) \leq n_2 \Big\} \cap \Big\{ \max_{|x| \geq K_\varepsilon,\, x \leq \mathscr{Z}_{n_2}} L_{\overline{T}_{n_2}}(x) \leq 2\,\varepsilon\, n_2 \Big\} \\ &\subset \Big\{ \max_{x \geq \mathscr{Z}_{n_2}} L_{\overline{T}_{n_2}}(x) \geq 2\,\varepsilon\, n_2 \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

whose probability (under $\mathbb{P}^*$) is less than δ. This together with (5.5) and (5.7) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}^*\Big(\max_{x\in\mathbb{F}(j)}|x|>K_\varepsilon\Big)\le 3\,\delta,$$

for all large j, which yields (1.7) and proves that $(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)})_{n\ge1}$ is tight. In order to localize the tightness, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3 *Let S be a finite subset of $\mathbb{T}$ disjoint from $\mathscr{M}$. Then $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely for all n large enough, $\mathbb{F}(n)\cap S=\emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $x\in S$ and $y\in\mathscr{M}$. Recall that under P_ω, for any $n\ge1$, $L_{\overline{T}_n}(x)$ (resp. $L_{\overline{T}_n}(y)$) has the law of a sum of i.i.d. random variables of law $L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ (resp. $L_{\overline{T}_1}(y)$). According to the strong law of large numbers, $n^{-1}L_{\overline{T}_n}(x)\underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}E_\omega[L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)]=\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}$ and $n^{-1}L_{\overline{T}_n}(y)\underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}E_\omega[L_{\overline{T}_1}(y)]=\mathrm{e}^{-U(y)}$, P_ω- almost surely.

By definition of $\mathscr{M}$ and since $S\cap\mathscr{M}=\emptyset$, we have $\mathrm{e}^{-U(x)}<\mathrm{e}^{-U(y)}$. Therefore, P_ω-almost surely there exists n_0 large enough such that for any $n\ge n_0$, we have $L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(x)<L_{\overline{T}_n}(y)$. By the monotonicity, for all $k\in[\overline{T}_n;\overline{T}_{n+1}]$, $L_k(x)\le L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(x)<L_{\overline{T}_n}(y)\le L_k(y)$, thus $L_k(x)<L_k(y)$ for all $k\ge\overline{T}_{n_0}$. Hence P_ω-a.s. for all n large enough $x\notin\mathbb{F}(n)$ and therefore, S being finite, almost surely for all n large enough $\mathbb{F}(n)\cap S=\emptyset$. □

Let $0<\varepsilon<\frac12$. Recall the definition of K_ε from (3.1). For any $n\ge1$, $A>0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\ge K_\varepsilon\big)\le\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\in[K_\varepsilon,A],K_\varepsilon<A\big)+\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\ge A\big).$$

The sequence $(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|)_{n\ge1}$ being tight, there exists A large enough such that for all large $n\ge n_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\ge K_\varepsilon\big)\le\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\in[K_\varepsilon,A],K_\varepsilon<A\big)+\varepsilon<2\varepsilon,$$

by applying Proposition 3.1: $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{F}(n)}|x|\in[K_\varepsilon,A],K_\varepsilon<A\big)=0$.

Therefore for all large n,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{F}(n)\subset\{x\in\mathbb{T}\ :\ |x|<K_\varepsilon\}\big)\ge1-2\varepsilon. \tag{5.8}$$

As $\{x\in\mathbb{T}:|x|<K_\varepsilon\}\cap\mathscr{M}^c$ is almost surely finite and disjoint from $\mathscr{M}$, according to Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{F}(n)\cap\{x\in\mathbb{T}:|x|<K_\varepsilon\}\cap\mathscr{M}^c=\varnothing\big)\underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}1,$$

which together with (5.8) yield (1.7) and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

5.3 Proofs of Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4

Proof of Corollary 1.3. At first, we shall prove a preliminary result which will also be used in the proof of Corollary 1.4. Let $U_{min} := \min_{x\in\mathbb{T}} U(x)$. Under P_ω, the process $\big(n^{-1/2}\big(L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) - n\mathrm{e}^{-U_{min}}\big)_{x\in\mathscr{M}}\big)_{n\geq 0}$ is a lattice random walk with covariance matrix equal to that of $(L_{\overline{T}_1}(x))_{x\in\mathscr{M}}$. The coefficients of this matrix are finite, as for any $x \in \mathscr{M}$, $L_{\overline{T}_1}(x)$ is stochastically smaller than a geometric random variable. We claim that the matrix is of rank $M := \#\mathscr{M}$, so that the random walk is a *genuinely* M-dimensional random walk. Indeed, suppose that there exists $(a_x)_{x\in\mathscr{M}}$ a sequence of real numbers (which may depend on the environment) not all zero such that P_ω-a.s., $\sum_{x\in\mathscr{M}} a_x L_{\overline{T}_1}(x) = 0$. Let x_0 be such that $a_{x_0} \neq 0$ and for any other $y \in \mathscr{M}$ such that $a_y \neq 0$, $|x_0| \leq |y|$. As $L_{\overline{T}_1}(x_0) = \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_0) + \sum_{\overleftarrow{z}=x_0} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z)$ (see (2.19)), we have that

$$\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(x_0) = -\sum_{\overleftarrow{z}=x_0} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z) + \frac{1}{a_{x_0}} \sum_{y\in\mathscr{M}, y\neq x_0} a_y\Big(\overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(y) + \sum_{\overleftarrow{z}=y} \overline{L}_{\overline{T}_1}(z)\Big),$$

almost surely. This is absurd as conditionally on the environment the left member of this equation is a non-trivial random variable only depending on the behaviour of the walk on the edge $(\overleftarrow{x_0}, x_0)$, whereas the right member only depends on the behaviour of the walk on strictly distinct edges. Therefore there exists no such family $(a_x)_{x\in\mathscr{M}}$, and the covariance matrix of $(L_{\overline{T}_n}(x))_{x\in\mathscr{M}}$ for any n is of rank M.

Now we are ready to prove Corollary 1.3. Suppose that $\#\mathscr{M} \geq 4$ (otherwise the result is immediate, as $\mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}$ for all large n), and let w, x, y, z be any four distinct vertices of $\mathscr{M}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_n^{w,x,y,z} :&= \{L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(y) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(w) \geq L_{\overline{T}_n}(z)\}\\ &= \{0 \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(y) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(z) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(w) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now as under P_ω, the $L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(w) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w)$ are i.i.d. random variables dominated by a geometric variable, there is a $\lambda > 0$ such that almost surely for all n large enough, $L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(w) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) < \lambda \log(1+n)$. But as proved previously, $\big(L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w), L_{\overline{T}_n}(y) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w), L_{\overline{T}_n}(z) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(w)\big)_{n\geq 0}$ is a genuinely 3-dimensional random walk with finite covariance matrix. Hence, equation (2) p. 313 of [38] ensures that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely for all n large enough this random walk is out of the ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, centered at the origin and of radius $n^{1/2-\varepsilon}$. This ensures that $P_\omega\big(\mathcal{A}_n^{w,x,y,z} \text{ i.o. as } n \to \infty\big) = 0$. Hence almost surely, for all but a finite number of n, if $L_{\overline{T}_n}(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(y) \leq L_{\overline{T}_n}(z)$, then for all $k \in [\overline{T}_n, \overline{T}_{n+1}]$ we have $L_k(w) \leq L_{\overline{T}_{n+1}}(w) < L_{\overline{T}_n}(z) \leq L_k(z)$.

The vertices w, x, y, z playing symmetrical roles, we have the same result for any ordering of w, x, y, z, and so for all but a finite number of k, we have that $L_k(w), L_k(x), L_k(y)$ and $L_k(z)$ are not all equal.

The set $\mathscr{M}$ being finite, this result stands simultaneously for all quadruplets of vertices of $\mathscr{M}$: there is only a finite number of times at which four vertices of $\mathscr{M}$ have the same local time. In particular, there is only a finite number of times k at which three vertices of $\mathscr{M}$ are in $\mathbb{F}(k)$ (since vertices of $\mathbb{F}(k)$ have the same local time), and since $\mathbb{F}(k) \subset \mathscr{M}$ for all k large enough ($\kappa \in (2, \infty]$), this yields (1.10).

Now we show that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \#\mathbb{F}(n) = \min(3, M), \tag{5.9}$$

where $M := \#\mathscr{M}$. In view of the (1.10) and (1.6) , it suffices to prove that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \#\mathbb{F}(n) \geq \min(3, M)$. When $M = 1$, there is nothing to prove. Let $M \geq 2$. Let $\mathscr{M} = \{x_i, 1 \leq i \leq M\}$. Observe that $(L_{\overline{T}_n}(x_i) - L_{\overline{T}_n}(x_1))_{2\leq i\leq M}$ is a genuinely $(M-1)$-dimensional centered random walk with finite covariance matrix, almost surely it returns to the origin if $M \in \{2, 3\}$, and to $\{0\} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}_-^{M-3}$ if $M \geq 4$, infinitely many times [We have used Uchiyama [40] for the case $M \geq 4$]. Now, as a.s. $\mathbb{F}(k) \subset \mathscr{M}$ for all k large enough, we deduce that a.s. $\mathbb{F}(\overline{T}_n) \supset \{x_i, 1 \leq i \leq \min(3, M)\}$ for infinitely many n. This proves (5.9) when $M \geq 2$. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Let $x \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\mathscr{M}$; according to Lemma 5.3, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all large n, $\mathbb{F}(n) \cap \{x\} = \varnothing$. Hence a.s. $x \notin \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n)$ and therefore $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}$.

Moreover, notice that (1.6), (1.7) and (1.9) ensure that almost surely, there exist $A \geq 1$ and an increasing sequence $(\phi_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of integers such that for any $n \geq 1$, there exists a vertex $x \in \mathbb{F}(\phi_n)$ such that $|x| < A$. The set $\{x \in \mathbb{T} \ : \ |x| < A\}$ being finite, a fortiori there exists an $|x'| < A$ such that $x' \in \mathbb{F}(\phi_n)$ infinitely many times, i.e. $x' \in \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n)$; Moreover x' must be a site in $\mathscr{M}$ as $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}$.

Let us now consider the case $\kappa \in [2, \infty]$ and prove that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n) = \mathscr{M}$. If $\kappa > 2$, then according to (1.6), almost surely for all n large enough we have $\mathbb{F}(n) \subset \mathscr{M}$. If $\kappa = 2$, then (1.7) together with Borel-Cantelli's lemma ensure that there exists a *deterministic* increasing sequence $(t_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of integers such that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all n large enough, $\mathbb{F}(t_n) \in \mathscr{M}$.

Now recalling from the proof of Corollary 1.3 that under P_ω, the process $\big(\Xi_n := n^{-1/2}\big(L_{\overline{T}_n}(x) - n\mathrm{e}^{-U_{min}}\big)_{x\in\mathscr{M}}\big)_{n\geq 0}$ is a genuinely M-dimensional random walk, where $U_{min} := \min_{x\in\mathbb{T}} U(x)$. Hence for any set of the form $\{(k_1, \ldots, k_M) \in \mathbb{Z}^M : k_1 < 0, \ldots, k_{i-1} < 0, k_i >$

$0, k_{i+1} < 0, \dots k_M < 0\}$ (for any fixed $1 \le i \le k$) will be recurrent for Ξ_{t_n} [in fact, take for example $i = M$ and let $A_n := \{\Xi_{t_n} \in \{(k_1, \dots, k_M) \in \mathbb{Z}^M : k_1 < 0, \dots, k_{M-1} < 0, k_M > 0\}$. By the central limit theorem, there exists some positive constant c such that $P_\omega(A_n) \to c$ as $n \to \infty$, hence $P_\omega(\limsup_{n\to\infty} A_n) \ge c$. This probability is in fact equal to 1 thanks to the Hewitt-Savage zero-one law]; consequently, P_ω-a.s. for any $x \in \mathscr{M}$ there exist infinitely many $n \ge 1$ such that $L_{\overline{T}_{\phi_n}}(x) = \max_{y\in\mathscr{M}} L_{\overline{T}_{\phi_n}}(y)$, and so $x \in \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(\phi_n) \subset \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{F}(n)$.

This completes the proof of Corollary 1.4. □

A Appendix

Proof of (4.4). Let i be a large integer. By the definition of the transition matrix P in (2.9), we see that

$$Pf(i) = \mathbf{E}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^i \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-nS_1}}{(1+\mathrm{e}^{-S_1})^{i+n+1}} \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)}.$$

We claim that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist some i_ε, $c_\gamma > 0$ such that for all $i \ge i_\varepsilon$ and $0 < x < 1$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^i \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)} x^n \le (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma} f(i) \Big((1+\varepsilon)\, x^\gamma + c_\gamma\, \varepsilon (1+x^{-1}(1-x)^{1+\gamma})\Big). \quad \text{(A.1)}$$

Let us admit for the moment (A.1) and finish the proof of (4.4). Indeed, by (A.1), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} Pf(i) &\le f(i)\, \mathbf{E}\Big((1+\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma S_1} + c_\gamma \varepsilon\, [(1+\mathrm{e}^{-S_1})^\gamma + \mathrm{e}^{S_1}]\Big) \\ &\le f(i) \Big((1+\varepsilon)\mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma S_1} + c'\, \varepsilon\Big), \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < \gamma < \kappa - 1$, $\mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma S_1} < 1$, and we can choose a sufficiently small ε such that $(1+\varepsilon)\mathbf{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma S_1} + c'\,\varepsilon < 1$ and get (4.4).

It remain to prove (A.1). Firstly we observe that for all $0 < x < 1$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^i \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)} x^n = \frac{\Gamma(1+\gamma)}{i!} \frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}x^i}\Big(x^i (1-x)^{-(1+\gamma)}\Big),$$

By using the change of variable: $y = 1 - x$, we get that for any $0 < x < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}x^i}\Big(x^i(1-x)^{-(1+\gamma)}\Big) \\
= \;& (-1)^i \frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}y^i}\Big((1-y)^i y^{-1-\gamma}\Big)\Big|_{y=1-x} \\
= \;& (-1)^i \frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}y^i}\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{i} C_i^k\,(-1)^k\,y^{k-1-\gamma}\Big)\Big|_{y=1-x} \\
= \;& y^{-i-1-\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{i} C_i^k\,(-1)^i\,(k-1-\gamma)\times\cdots\times(k-i-\gamma)\times(-y)^k\Big|_{y=1-x} \\
= \;& i!\,y^{-i-1-\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{i}\frac{(i+\gamma-k)\cdots(\gamma+1)}{(i-k)!}\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(-y)^k\Big|_{y=1-x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $f(i-k+1) = \frac{\Gamma(i+\gamma-k+1)}{\Gamma(i-k+1)}$ for any $0 \le k \le i$, we get that for any $0 < x < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^i\,\frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)}\,x^n \\
= \;& (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma}\sum_{k=0}^{i} f(i-k+1)\,\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k \\
=: \;& (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma}\Big(I_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} + J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)}\Big), \qquad (\mathrm{A}.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} &:= \sum_{k=0}^{l} f(i-k+1)\,\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k, \\
J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} &:= \sum_{k=l+1}^{i} f(i-k+1)\,\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k,
\end{aligned}$$

with $l = l(\gamma)$ the unique integer such that $l-1 \le \gamma < l$. When $i \to \infty$, $f(i-k+1) \sim f(i)$ uniformly on $k \in \{0, 1, .., l\}$, it follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $i_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $i \ge i_\varepsilon$ and all $0 < x < 1$,

$$I_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} = f(i)\sum_{k=0}^{l}\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k + \varepsilon f(i).$$

For the term $J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)}$, we discuss two cases according to the parity of l:

(i) If l is even, then every term in the sum in $J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)}$ is positive (for any $0 < x < 1$). By using the fact that f is increasing, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} &\leq f(i) \sum_{k=l+1}^{i} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k \\ &\leq f(i) \sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k, \end{aligned}$$

(because every term in the above sum is positive). It follows that for any $i \geq i_\varepsilon$, and all $0 < x < 1$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^{i} \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)} x^n \leq (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma} f(i)\, x^\gamma + \varepsilon\, (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma} f(i).$$

(ii) If l is odd, then every term in the sum in $J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)}$ is negative. For all large $i \geq i_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(\mathrm{A}.2)} &\leq \sum_{k=l+1}^{i^{1/2}} f(i-k+1) \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k \\ &\leq (1-\varepsilon) f(i) \sum_{k=l+1}^{i^{1/2}} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k, \end{aligned}$$

by using the fact that as $i \to \infty$, $f(i-k+1) \sim f(i)$ uniformly on $l < k \leq i^{1/2}$. Observe that for some positive constant c_γ, $\left|\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}\right| \leq c_\gamma\, i^{-\ell/2}$ for any $k > i^{1/2}$ (which is larger than ℓ). It follows that for all $0 < x < 1$, $\sum_{k>i^{1/2}} \left|\frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)\cdots(\gamma-(k-1))}{k!}(x-1)^k\right| \leq c_\gamma\, i^{-\ell/2} x^{-1}(1-x)^{i^{1/2}} \leq \varepsilon\, x^{-1}(1-x)^{1+\gamma}$.

Therefore when ℓ is odd, we get that for all $i \geq i_\varepsilon$ and all $0 < x < 1$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{i+n}^{i} \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)} x^n \leq (1-x)^{-i-1-\gamma} f(i) \Big((1+\varepsilon)\, x^\gamma + c\,\varepsilon + c_\gamma\, i^{-\ell/2} x^{-1} (1-x)^{i^{1/2}} \Big).$$

Therefore we get (A.1) and complete the proof of (4.4). □

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Elie Aïdékon for stimulating remarks and to Vladimir Vatutin for helpful references. Special thanks go to Zhan Shi for his enthusiastic and intensive discussions on the topic during the whole preparation of the manuscript.

References

[1] Aïdékon, E. and de Raphélis, Loïc. (2015). Scaling limit of the recurrent biased random walk on a Galton-Watson tree. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* (to appear).

[2] Afanasyev, V.I. (2001). On the maximum of a subcritical branching process in a random environment. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications.* **93**, 87–107.

[3] Andreoletti, P. and Chen, X. (2015+). Range and critical generations of a random walk on Galton-Watson trees. (Preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.01121).

[4] Andreoletti, P. and Debs, P. (2014). The number of generations entirely visited for recurrent random walks on random environment. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **27**, 518–538.

[5] Andreoletti, P. and Debs, P. (2014). Spread of visited sites of a random walk along the generations of a branching process. *Electron. J. Probab.* **19**, 1–22.

[6] Bass, R.F., Eisenbaum, N. and Shi, Z. (2000). The most visited sites of symmetric stable processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **116**, no. 3, 391–404.

[7] Bass, R.F. and Griffin, P.S. (1985). The most visited site of Brownian motion and simple random walk. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **70**, 417–436.

[8] Ben Arous, G. and Fribergh, A. (2014+). Biased random walks on random graphs. (preprint, arXiv:1406.5076v1)

[9] Bertoin, J. (2011). On the maximal offspring in a critical branching process with infinite variance. *J. Appl. Probab.* **48**, no. 2, 576–582.

[10] Biggins, J.D. (1977). Chernoff's theorem in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Probab.* **14**, 630–636.

[11] Biggins, J.D. (1976). The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **8**, 446–459.

[12] Biggins, J.D. and Kyprianou, A.E. (2004). Measure change in multitype branching. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **36**, 544–581.

[13] de Raphélis, Loïc. (2016). Scaling limit of the random walk in random environment in the subdiffusive case. *Preprint.*

[14] Eisenbaum, N. and Khoshnevisan, D. (2002). On the most visited sites of symmetric Markov processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **101**, Issue 2, 241–256.

[15] Erdős, P. and Révész, P. (1984). On the favourite points of a random walk. *Mathematical Structures – Computational Mathematics – Mathematical Modelling* **2**, pp. 152–157. Sofia.

[16] Faraud, G. (2011). A central limit theorem for random walk in a random environment on marked Galton-Watson trees. *Electron. J. Probab.* **16**, 174–215.

[17] Grincevičius, A.K. (1975). One limit distribution for a random walk on the line. *Lithunian Math. Trans.* **15** 580–589.

[18] Hammersley, J.M. (1974). Postulates for subadditive processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2**, 652–680.

[19] Hoel, P., Port, S. and Stone, C. (1972). *Introduction to Stochastic Processes.* Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

[20] Hu, Y. (2016+). Local times of subdiffusive biased walks on trees. (*J. Theoret. Probab.* (to appear), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.4507)

[21] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2000). The problem of the most visited site in random environment. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **116**, 273–302.

[22] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2007). A subdiffusive behaviour of recurrent random walk in random environment on a regular tree. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **138** pp. 521-549)

[23] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2015). The most visited sites of biased random walks on trees. *Electr. J. Probab.* **20** no. 62, 1–14.

[24] Jagers, P. (1989). General branching processes as Markov fields. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **32** no. 2, 183–212.

[25] Kesten, H. (1973). Random difference equations and renewal theory for products of random matrices. *Acta Math.* **131** 207–248.

[26] Kingman, J.F.C. (1975). The first birth problem for an age-dependent branching process. *Ann. Probab.* **3**, 790–801.

[27] Kurtz, T., Lyons, R., Pemantle, R. and Peres, Y. (1997). A conceptual proof of the Kesten-Stigum theorem for multi-type branching processes. *Classical and modern branching processes (Minneapolis, MN, 1994)* pp.181–185, IMA Vol. Math. Appl., 84, Springer, New York.

[28] Liu, Q.S. (2000). On generalized multiplicative cascades. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **86**, 263–286.

[29] Lyons, R.: A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk. In: *Classical and Modern Branching Processes* (Eds.: K.B. Athreya and P. Jagers). *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications* **84**, (1997), 217–221. Springer, New York.

[30] Lyons, R. and Pemantle, R. (1992). Random walk in a random environment and first-passage percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 125–136.

[31] Marcus, M. (2001). The most visited sites of certain Lévy processes. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **14**, Issue 3, 867–885.

[32] Menshikov, M.V. and Petritis, D. (2002). On random walks in random environment on trees and their relationship with multiplicative chaos. In: *Mathematics and Computer Science II (Versailles, 2002)*, pp. 415–422. Birkhäuser, Basel.

[33] Neveu, J. (1987). Multiplicative martingales for spatial branching processes. In: *Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1987 (Princeton, NJ, 1987)*, pp 223–242, Progr. Probab. Statist., 15, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1988.

[34] Peres, Y. and Zeitouni, O. (2008). A central limit theorem for biased random walks on Galton-Watson trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **140**, 595–629.

[35] Révész, P. (2013). *Random Walk in Random and Non-Random Environments.* (Third edition). World Scientific, Singapore.

[36] Shi, Z. (2015). *Branching Random Walks*, École d'été Saint-Flour XLII (2012), *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **2151**. Springer, Berlin.

[37] Shiryayev, A. N. (1996). *Probability.* Translated from the first (1980) Russian edition by R. P. Boas. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 95. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[38] Spitzer, F. (1976). *Principles of Random Walk*, Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed., 1976.

[39] Tóth, B. (2001). No more than three favourite sites for simple random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **29**, 484–503.

[40] Uchiyama, K. (1998). Wiener's test for random walks with mean zero and finite variance. *Ann. Probab.* **26**, 368–376.